

Muslim Opposition to Logic and Theology in the
Light of the Works of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūtī
(d. 911/1505)

**Muslim Opposition to Logic and Theology in the
Light of the Works of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūtī
(d. 911/1505)**

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. P.F. van der Heijden,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op dinsdag 4 november 2008
klokke 10:00 uur

door
Mufti Ali
Geboren te Serang (Banten), Indonesië
in 1972

Promotiecommissie

Promotor : Prof. dr. P. S. van Koningsveld
Referent: Prof. dr. H. Daiber
Overige leden: Dr. M. Ghaly
Prof. dr. M.S. Berger
Prof. dr. R. Kruk

Tanda kenangan
untuk yang tercinta
dan tersayang
Anita,
Mehrunnisa, dan
Mahira Mujahida

Table of Content

Preface.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Abbreviations.....	viii
Introduction	
Modern Theories on the Origin of Islamic Theology.....	1
Modern Views on Islamic Opposition to Logic and Theology.....	14
al-Suyūṭī's Position.....	28
The Scope of the Present work.....	33
Chapter One	
<i>al-Qawl al-Mushriq fī Tahrīm al-Ishtigāl bi ‘Ilm al-Manṭiq</i> Its Manuscripts, the Date and Purpose of its Composition as well as its Content and Sources.....	34
1.1. The manuscripts.....	34
1.2. The Date and Purpose of the Composition of QM.....	34
1.3. The Content.....	35
1.4. Conclusion: Evaluation of QM as a source for the history of the opposition against logic.....	60
Chapter Two	
<i>Jahd al-Qarīha fī Tajrīd al-Naṣīḥa: al-Suyūṭī’s Abridgement of Ibn Taymiyya’s Naṣīḥat Ahl al-Īmān fī al-Radd ‘alā Manṭiq al-Yūnān</i>	67
2.1. The Date and Purpose of Abridgement of <i>Naṣīḥa</i>	67
2.2. The Contribution Made by al-Suyūṭī in Presenting IT’s Arguments more Comprehensibly.....	67
2.3. Elements of IT’s Religious Viewpoints Against Logic and Theology in JQ.....	68
2.4. How did al-Suyūṭī select IT’s viewpoints against logic in this abridgement?.....	73
2.5. The rationale of al-Suyūṭī’s selection of IT’s arguments in JQ.....	78
Chapter Three	
<i>Sawn al-Manṭiq wa Ḥ-Kalām ‘an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa Ḥ-Kalām</i> : Its Manuscript, the Date and Purpose of its Composition as well as its Content and Sources.....	80
3.1. Manuscript and Edition of SM.....	80
3.2. Date of Composition of SM.....	83
3.3. Background and Purpose of the Composition of SM.....	84
3.4. The Contents of SM.....	85
3.5. Conclusion.....	144
Chapter Four	
Al-Suyūṭī’s <i>Fatwā</i> against Logic: Its Manuscript and its Content as well as its Source.....	153
4.1. The Manuscript of the <i>Fatwā</i>	153
4.2. The Content of the <i>Fatwā</i>	153
4.3. Evaluation of the sources.....	158
Chapter Five	
Conclusion.....	160
5.1. QM, JQ, SM and the <i>Fatwā</i> as Sources for the History of the	160

Opposition to Logic and Theology.....	162
5.2. Prosopographical Data against Logic in the Works of al-Suyūṭī.....	162
5.3. Al-Suyūṭī's Changing Views on al-Shāfi‘ī, al-Gazālī and al-Juwaynī in QM, JQ, SM and the <i>Fatwā</i>	166
Bibliography.....	169
Samenvatting.....	184
Curriculum Vitae.....	187

Preface

Well-known place names and terms, for instance Mecca, Madina, Jerusalem, Damascus, Bagdad, Islam, Sunna, Koran are transcribed in their English spellings. Less common place names are transliterated. Technical terms are translated wherever possible, but those such as *umma*, *fatwā*, *shari‘a*, *kalām*, *shayh*, *ḥāfiẓ*, *āثار*, *tasawwuf* and *habar* are retained in their Arabic form.

With the exception of page 67-79, the words in square brackets represent my own insertions. I also used parentheses for equivalent Arabic terms taken from al-Suyūtī's texts.

For the Koranic verses cited, I have constantly depended on Bell's translation. In cases where the Koranic verse is not completely quoted by the author, the completion based also on Bell's translation is given in the notes when it appeared necessary for the understanding of the text. When identifying individuals mentioned in al-Suyūṭī texts, I have sometimes also used notes of the first edition of SM and those of SU, when I deemed it necessary. These I marked respectively with the letters N (for al-Nashshār, the editor of SM) and H (for Hamdān, the editor of SU).

The transliteration system that I follow is:

						Long Vowels	Diphthongs
,	ء	z	ز	q	ق	ā	aw
b	ب	s	س	k	ك	ái	و
t	ت	sh	ش	l	ل	ū	ay
th	ث	s̪	ص	m	م	í	ي
j	ج	d̪	ض	n	ن		
h	ح	t̪	ط	h	ه		
h̪	خ	z̪	ظ	w	و	a; at	ة
d	د	‘	ع	y	ي		(article), al – and 'l-
dh	ذ	g	غ				
r	ر	F	ف				

Acknowledgements

First of all, my departure to the Netherlands in November 2001 would not have been possible without the official permission of Prof. Dr. H.M.A. Tihami, M.A., the Rector of the State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) ‘Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten’ and without my wife’s sacrifice to be left by her husband to take care of our beloved daughters, Mehr and Mahira with the assistance of my beloved mother, Hj. Siti Aminah and my respectable parents-in-law, H. Alih Ajalih and Hj. Oniwati.

This research was made possible thanks to the financial support of INIS (Indonesian Netherlands Cooperation in Islamic Studies). At INIS, I sincerely thank Prof. Dr. W.A.L. Stokhof, Dr. N.J.G. Kaptein, Dijk van der Meij, Jantien Delwel, Marise van Amersfoort, and Josien Stremmelaar.

When dealing with the rich oriental collections and abundant research references in the Leiden University Library, I was always helpfully assisted by its staff. Arabic manuscripts from Cairo, Damascus, Dublin and Berlin were rendered accessible to me through the assistance of Dr. Nursamad Kamba (the Indonesian Educational Attaché of the Indonesian Embassy in Cairo), Ust. Farouk, Madame Usaima and Mrs. Kim Duistermaat (Damascus), Carla William (Dublin), and Dr. Hans Kurio (Berlin).

Let me also express my special gratitude to Mr. Drs. Ed Walbeehm, my landlord, who made me familiar with social-cultural life of the people in Leiden and whose help was indispensable. Many thanks are also due to the Family of Eman Sulaeman Yasin in The Hague and to Pak Timur Pradopo in Jakarta. My brothers and sisters: Siti Solehah, Siti Hasanah, Siti Aisah, Muhdi, Mukhlis, Mumin Muaddib, Mansur, Khudri, Andi also deserve to be mentioned here.

My early love for the study of Arabic was instilled by my beloved and reverend father, the late Aslihuddin (d. 1993) who already taught me *sarf* and *nahw* when I was ten. His patient and stimulating Arabic lessons enabled me to memorize *al-'Awāmil* and *al-Ājurumiyya* (basic texts for Arabic grammar commonly used in Indonesian Religious Schools) when I was thirteen. His difficulties in understanding *al-Waraqāt fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh* by Abū al-Ma‘ālī al-Juwaynī, due to which he spent almost half of his life learning Arabic, in one way or another, motivated me to make an attempt at ‘conquering’ its complexities as well. My understanding of the advanced level of Arabic grammar was made possible thanks to the fatherly guidance of K.H. Bahruddin Afif and the late Drs. H. Tohir Sariq. Classical Arabic became a spoken language to me with the assistance of Ust. Ahmad Ardani, Mahsun, Suwondo, Murtadla, Anwar Mukassah, and others.

My interest in Islamic Studies was instigated by my teacher in Junior High School, the devoted Drs. Ade Mahmuddin whose inspiring lessons brought to my knowledge celebrated figures such as Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afgānī, Muḥammad ‘Abduh, Rashīd Riḍā, Shakib Arselan, etc, the knowledge of whose ‘relation’ with classical Islam became clearer only six years later thanks to Dr. Saeful Anwar, my academic supervisor in IAIN, who always opened his house to satisfy my curiosities regarding al-Gazālī, al-Hallāj, al-Juwaynī, Ibn Taymiyya, Niẓām al-Mulk and the modern sources dealing with them. The latter’s drawing my attention to the works of the orientalists, such as L. Massignon, I. Goldziher, G.H.A. Juynboll,

Snouck Hurgronje, W.B. Hallaq, and others provided me with the ‘inner energy’ to learn several European languages.

My understanding of some French, Dutch and German sources would not have been possible without the work of my language teachers, affiliated to the Goethe-Institut Rotterdam and Murnau (Munich), the Alliance Française The Hague and the Regional Opleiding Centrum (ROC, Leiden). Their systematic teachings helped me to learn French, Dutch and German.

My discussions with several individuals in Indonesia also helped me to continue my study in the Netherlands: Prof. K.H. Wahab Afif, MA, Drs. Huriyyudin Humaidi, my uncles, Abdul Aziz, MA and Kabir Rifa’i, Ir. Pram Rahmat, Dr. H. Ilzamuddin Ma’mur, MA, Drs. H. Zakaria, M.Pd, Prof. Dr. H. Utang Ranuwijaya, the late Drs. K.H. Mutawali Waladi, Prof. Dr. H. Fauzul Iman, Drs. H. Syibli Sarjaya, L.M.L., Drs. Habudin, Hudairi, Kak Uus, Kak Mahyudi, and others. Colleagues Hafid Asad, Beben, Wowo Suharyono, Imam Muslih, Maman, Aria, Imam Masruhi, the late ust. Hashim, Kak Iik, Buhari, Arisfin, Hidayatullah, Hasan Basri, Soni Ahdiat, and others are also worthy of being mentioned here.

My friends in the ‘Laboratorium Bantenologi’ and the ‘Banten Heritage’ should also be mentioned here, respectively: Helmi, Ade, Ayat, Ibnu, Yanwar, Asti, Kak Ali Fadilah, Mas Budi, Nely, Dadan, Ruby. Some individuals and my colleagues in Leiden, Dato’ Prof. Dr. Saleh Yapaar, Prof. Dr. Haron Daod, Dr. Teuku Iskandar, Zulkifli, Nur Ichwan, Amr, Ghaly, Anwar, Didin, Euis, Muslih, Arif Subhan, Jajat, Dahlan, Euis, Mbak Yuni Ch., Suryadi, Noerhaidi, Mujiburahman, Bunyan, Tonang, Johny Tjia, and Syaifudin Zuhri deserve my gratitude.

My zeal for learning will never be satisfied, even if ‘the collection of the UB’ would be transferred to my hometown in Banten. What I have been attempting to do forms only a single footnote to the rich oriental collections and the studies undertaken by the scholars of both the Western and the Muslim World.

Mufti Ali,
Leiden 2008

Abbreviations

- ASP: Arabic Sciences and Philosophy
AEL: Arabic-English Lexicon
BO: Bibliotheca Orientalis
BSOAS: Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Study
BW: *Bugyat al-Wu‘āt fī Ṭabaqāt al-Lugawiyīn wa ‘l-Nuḥāt*
DK: *al-Durar al-Kāmina fī A‘yān al-Mi‘ā al-Thāmina*
DL: *al-Daw’ al-Lāmi‘ li Ahl al-Qarn al-Tāsi‘*
DhK: *Dhumm al-Kalām wa Ahlih*
DTH: *Kitāb al-Dhayl ‘alā Ṭabaqāt al-Hanābila*
EI¹: the Encyclopaedia of Islam, the first edition
EI²: the Encyclopaedia of Islam, the new edition
EQ: the Encyclopaedia of the Qur’ān
FW: *Fawāt al-Wafayāt*
GAL: *Geschichte die Arabischen Literatur*
GAS: *Geschichte des Arabischen Schriftum*
HM: *Husn al-Muḥādara fī Aḥbār Miṣr wa ‘l-Qāhira*
IAH: *Al-Intiṣār li Ahl al-Hadīth*
IJMES: International Journal for Middle Eastern Studies
ILS: Islamic Law and Society
IS: Islamic Studies
IT: Ibn Taymiyya
IU: *Iḥyā’ ‘Ulūm al-Dīn*
JB: *Jāmi‘ Bayān al-‘Ilm wa Faḍlīh*
JQ: *Jahd al-Qariha fī Tajrīd al-Naṣīha*
JIS: Journal of Islamic Studies
JRAS: Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
KA: *al-Kunyā wa ‘l-Ansāb*
KWS: *al-Kawākib al-Sā’ira bi A‘yān al-Mi‘ā al-Āshira*
MB: *Manāhij al-Baḥth ‘ind Mufakkiri ‘l-Islām*
NAI: *Naṣīhat Ahl al-Īmān fī ‘l-Radd ‘alā Manṭiq al-Yūnān*
NU: *Nazm al-‘Iqyān*
QM: *Al-Qawl al-Mushriq fī Taḥrīm al-Ishtigāl bi ‘Ilm al-Manṭiq*
QQ: *Qūt al-Qulūb*
REI: *Revue des Etudes Islamiques*
RHR: Revue de l’ Histoire des Religions
SAH: *Sharaf Asḥāb al-Hadīth*
SAN: *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā‘*
SI: *Studia Islamica*
SM: *Sawn al-Manṭiq wa ‘l-Kalām ‘an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa ‘l-Kalām*
SU: *Sharḥ Uṣūl I‘tiqād Ahl al-Sunna wa ‘l-Jamā‘a*
TG: Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra. Eine
Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im frühen Islam
TH: *Ṭabaqāt al-Huffāz*
TI: *Ta’rīh al-Islām*
TM: *Ṭabaqāt al-Mufassirīn*
TMM: *Tartib al-Madārik wa Taqrīb al-Masālik li Ma‘rifat A‘lām Madhhāb Mālik*

TSK: *Tabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyya al-Kubrā*

WW: *al-Wāfi bī'l-Wafayāt*

ZDMG: Zeitschrift für Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft

Introduction

Several works of the Egyptian polymath, Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) invite us to take a fresh look at the much debated issues of the origins and status of theology and logic in Islam. As a staunch defender of the prophetic Sunna, al-Suyūṭī discussed these issues at several stages of his intellectual development. The result was a rich documentation of the history of the opposition to theology and logic in Islam, which deserves to be taken into account fully by modern scholars studying these issues.

Modern scholarship on the origin of Islamic theology can be divided into six views, respectively asserting: (1) the Hellenistic influence on the origin of Islamic theology; (2) Islamic theology mainly as the result of an internal development; (3) Christian influence on Islamic theology; (4) Jewish contributions to Islamic theology; (5) Persian features in Islamic theology; and (6) Indian elements in Islamic theology.

In addition to the origin of Islamic theology, modern scholarship also more specifically deals with the opposition to logic and theology. Goldziher, Madkour, Hartmann, al-Nashshār, al-Ṭabāṭabā’ī, Hallaq, Endress, Van Koningsveld, and Griffel have discussed the Islamic opposition to logic, while Makdisi, Daiber, Pavlin, Abrahamov, Juynboll and al-Hashshash have dealt with the Muslim opposition to theology (*kalām*) and the *mutakallimūn*. The following passages will be devoted to discuss modern views on the origin of Islamic theology (1) and on the Islamic opposition to logic and theology (2). In the third section attention will be paid to al-Suyūṭī’s four works on these issues (3). On the basis of these discussions, we shall formulate our research question and explain the composition and the scope of the present study.

1. Modern Views on the Origin of Islamic Theology

Discussion on the origin of Islamic Theology occupies an important position in the works of modern scholars. Dealing with the question of how Islamic theology originated and developed, they propose at least six views. Some of them associate the development of Islamic theology with the importation of Greek sciences through the movement of translation, which introduced the Hellenistic tradition into the Islamic world. Some scholars point to the influence of Christianity and Judaism. Some emphasize an internal development independent of foreign influences; while others ascribe its origin to the Indian and Persian intellectual tradition which was introduced into Islam through cultural contact.

1.1. Constant Elements of Hellenistic Influence in Old and Contemporary Views

So far, the origin and the development of Islamic philosophical theology, *kalām* as fostered by Muslim contact with Hellenism, has become the dominant view of modern scholarship. Generally speaking, the conceptions of this idea are founded on several patterns of arguments: (1) terminological; (2) chronological; (3) ontological; and (4) logical/philosophical.

Without a single reference to al-Suyūṭī's SM, works dealing with this issue, like those by Goldziher,¹ Laoust,² Watt,³ Gibb,⁴ Von Grunebaum,⁵ Fakhry,⁶ Madjid,⁷ and Van Koningsveld⁸ either explicitly or implicitly associate the origin of the theological speculative movement in Islam with the importation of Greek works into the Muslim world. Their approaches in dealing with this topic, aim at, to borrow Cerić's words, 'construing origins and development of Islamic theology in the context of Muslim political and philosophical development,' as reflected in their discussion of the 'historico-political milieu of a particular period,' and 'the introduction of Greek philosophy into the Muslim world in the end of 2nd century of Hijra.'⁹

The transmission of Greek philosophy and sciences into the Islamic world through the translation movement in the eighth and ninth century has played a major role in accelerating the Hellenizing process in the Islamic world. The emergence of scholastic theology (*kalām*), Islamic Aristotelianism and Neoplatonism (*falsafa*) in the Islamic world is to be considered, in Madjid's opinion, the direct cultural influence of such a process.¹⁰

This whole marvellous process of cultural transmission which lead to the emergence of a rationalistic movement in the Islamic world was by no means a matter of coincidence or chance. History tells us about the systematic attempt undertaken by al-Ma'mūn (d. 216/833), who, being fascinated by the practical use of Greek philosophy and sciences, had issued the explicit policy of the state to promote the significance of the adoption of the 'foreign culture'. According to

¹Based on the study of Horovitz and Horten, Goldziher underlines that the philosophy of *kalām* should be seen within the context of the Greek philosophical tradition through "the paths of the pre-Aristotelian philosophers of nature, and in particular those of the atomists among them." See Goldziher, I., *Introduction to Islamic Theology and Law* (transl. By A. and R. Hamory (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1981), p. 1110-112.

²Laoust, H., *Les Schismes dans l'Islam* (Paris: Paris Payot, 1965)

³Watt, M. remarks: "...this was because *kalām*, in addition to using rational arguments, introduced and discussed non-Qur'anic concepts, mostly taken from Greek science and philosophy." See *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1973), p. 183.

⁴Gibb, Sir. H.A., 'The Influence of Islamic Culture on Medieval Europe', in *Bulletin of the John Ryland's Library*, Manchester, 38 (1955), p. 82-98.

⁵Grunebaum, G.E. Von, 'Islam and Hellenism', in Dunning s. Wilson (ed.), *Islam and Medieval Hellenism: Social and Cultural Perspectives* (London: Variourum Reprints, 1976).

⁶Fakhry, Majid, *A History of Islamic Philosophy*, New York: Columbia University Press (1983), 2nd ed.

⁷Madjid, Nurcholish, *Ibn Taymiyya in 'Kalam' and 'Falsafa' (A Problem of Reason and Revelation)*, unpub. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1984.

⁸Van Koningsveld, P. S., "Greek Manuscripts in the Early Abbasid Empire: Fiction and Facts about their Origin, Translation and Destruction," in BO, LV no.3/4, Mei-August (1998), p. 345-370.

⁹Ceric identifies several names making use of this approach: Goldziher, Gardet and Anawati, Watt, Laoust, Ahmad Amin and al-Nashshār. See Cerić, Mustafa, *Roots of Synthetic Theology in Islam: A Study of the Theology of Abū Maṣ'ūr al-Matūridī* (d. 333/944), (Kuala Lumpur: ISTAC, 1995), p. 1-4. Here the present author has taken the liberty to add some relevant names unidentified by Cerić.

¹⁰Madjid, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

Fakhry, al-Ma'mūn himself, the seventh Abbasid Caliph, being influenced by Greek philosophy, composed a number of treatises on theological questions in a speculative spirit. The speculative tendency in his theological thought, Fakhry says, led to the promotion of popular interest in scholastic theology and the support of the cause of the theological party (the Mu'tazilites), which had sought to apply the categories of Greek thought to Muslim dogmas.¹¹

As the result of such an explicit policy of the state, the people's interest to learn about the 'new culture' culminated in a great number of Greek treatises and books on philosophy and sciences being translated into Arabic and commentaries upon them being compiled. Al-Ma'mūn and his proponents, who were exemplified in legendary stories about this process by, borrowing Van Koningsveld's term, the 'Ma'mun cycle',¹² represented the Muslims with the inclusive cultural perception that was necessary to find the epistemological assistance of elements derived from other cultures. Thus, they represented the group of Muslims who did not regard their cultural achievements as self-sufficient and therefore needed to learn something from the outside.

This kind of cultural perception paved the way for Muslims to be provided with, according to Von Grunebaum, (a) "rational forms of thought and systematisation," (b) "logical procedures," (c) "methods of generalization and abstraction" and, with (d) "principles of classification."¹³

Such an inclusive attitude of Muslims towards a foreign culture provoked fervent criticism from the side of Muslims 'who regarded their cultural achievements as self-sufficient and those who needed nothing to learn from outside'.¹⁴ These groups of Muslims were represented in the already mentioned legendary stories by the 'Umar cycle', who had a hostile attitude towards 'things foreign'.

History since then witnessed the consecutive disputes between those with an inclusive attitude towards foreign culture and those who regarded Islamic culture as self-sufficient and having nothing to learn from the outside. If the former were represented by the rationalist group of Muslims, the most extreme of which were represented by the Mu'tazilite group, the latter were represented by the traditionalists, the most extreme of which, borrowing Abrahamov's classification, were found among the *Ahl al-Hadith*.¹⁵ This dispute culminated in the event of the *mihna*, the Inquisition by the Caliph al-Ma'mūn. This led to Ahmad b. Hanbal, who did not recognize the createdness of the Koran, a major doctrine of the Mu'tazilite's creed, risking his life.¹⁶

¹¹Fakhry, Majid, *A History of Islamic Philosophy*, (New York: Columbia University Press 1983), 2nd ed., p. 10-11.

¹²Van Koningsveld, *op. cit.*, p. 345-370.

¹³Von Grunebaum, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

¹⁴Gibb, *op. cit.*, p. 82-98.

¹⁵Abrahamov, *op. cit.*, p. ii-x, 1-12.

¹⁶It is plausible that Ahmad b. Hanbal rejected the concept of createdness of the Koran, because, according to Wensinck, he understood the doctrine as 'the very heart of the question of the qualities. We [viz. Wensinck] may suppose, therefore, that his rigorous defence of the eternity of the Koran had its root in the feeling that this dogma followed from the unique nature of the Holy Book, whereas the Mu'tazilite view in his eyes tended to lower the position of the words of Allah.' See Wensinck, A.J., *The Muslim Creed, Its*

Therefore, it is plausible if one concludes that the ‘fruit’ of Hellenism, i.e. scholastic theology (*kalām*), Islamic Aristotelianism and Neo-Platonism, (*falsafa*) have met with opposition from a great number of Muslims since their inception in the Islamic World in the eighth and ninth century. The inclusion of a number of logical concepts into juridical works, such as the theory of definition (*al-hadd*) and syllogism (*al-burhān*), which were included by al-Gazālī in his *al-Mustāṣfā* on legal theory, is an obvious example of an attempt by a Muslim scholar to protect himself from the threat of the traditionalists.¹⁷ The incineration of a great number of books of Muslim philosophers is another discernable example of traditionalists’ fervent opposition to *falsafa*.¹⁸

Like Islamic Aristotelianism and Neo-Platonism (*falsafa*), *kalām*, being considered as a part of the Hellenistic tradition, also became the target of the opposition of a great number of traditionalists. This is reflected *firstly*, in their prohibition of engaging in *kalām*, including the breaking off relations with, and banishment of, the *Mutakallimūn*; and *secondly*, in their refutation of the *Mutakallimūn*’s tenets.¹⁹

1.2. Internal Development

Before delving into a discussion of this view, it is worthwhile to note that the view asserting that Islamic theology was rather the result of an internal development was not introduced explicitly into modern scholarship until 1975, when two German orientalists, Van Ess and Daiber published their works. This is in marked contrast with modern scholars’ assertion of foreign elements in Islamic theology, which had been proposed since the first half of nineteenth century.

The advocates of this view, however, are of the opinion that the development of *kalām* in the Muslim world was not only triggered by an external factor closely associated with the translation movement of Greek writings but also by an internal factor, namely the need for the art of debate in defending their views against their adversaries. This view is shared, for instance, by Amin,²⁰ Gardet and Anawati.²¹

Amin is of the opinion that the internal factor for the development of *kalām* can be discerned in the fact that some Koranic verses were revealed to encounter various sects and pagans and to refute their religious views. The external factor, he argues on the other hand, is closely related to their being occupied with Greek philosophy in order to construct arguments in defence of

Genesis and Historical Development, (New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation 1979), 2nd ed., p. 86.

¹⁷Al-Gazālī’s adoption of Aristotelian logic, which is reflected in the fact that he included it in his work on legal theory, drew fervent criticism from a number of scholars of the traditionalist group, such as Abū Ishāq al-Marginānī (d. 513/1119), al-Qushayrī, al-Ṭūrūshī (d. 520), al-Mazīrī, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and al-Nawawi. See al-Nashshār, *Manāhij*, *op. cit.*, p. 143-4.

¹⁸Several scholars have discussed this topic specifically: J. Sadan in his “Genizah and Genizah-Like Practices in Islamic and Jewish Traditions,” in BO, 43 (1986), 36-58, esp. 52-3, and Van Koningsveld, “Greek Manuscripts,” *op. cit.*, p. 351.

¹⁹Abrahamov, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

²⁰See his discussion on this topic in Amin, A., *Duḥa 'l-Islām*, *op. cit.*, 3rd juz, p. 1-8.

²¹Gardet, L., and G. Anawati, *Introduction à la Théologie Musulmane* (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1948).

their views.²² In other words, the internal factor represents the polemical side, while the external factor shows the apologetical aspect.

Likewise, Gardet and Anawati argued that the ‘seed’ of rational tendencies had grown up as early as the time of the Companions. Ibn ‘Abbās, Ibn Mas‘ūd and ‘Ikrima, for instance, applied rational methods in interpreting Koranic verses through the process of *ijtihād* or a personal rational elaboration of certain meanings of the Koran. Although the term *kalām* did not yet exist in this period, according to them, this rational tendency played a decisive role in the orientation of *kalām*.²³

However, the most explicit contention of the indigenous development of *kalām* can only be found in the works of two German orientalists: Joseph van Ess and Hans Daiber. Van Ess shares the view that the *kalām* movement was produced ‘internally’ due to the politico-theological discussion originating from the debate on who was really entitled to succeed the Prophet after he died.²⁴ This view was also affirmed by Nasution who was of the opinion that the theological movement which arose in Islam originated from political issues.²⁵

Van Ess regards the emergence of Islamic theology, *kalām* and speculative sciences as coming from within. The contents of theology in the realm of Islam, Van Ess argues, are not identical with those in Latin or Greek, as ‘knowledge about God,’ but rather named after its style of argumentation: one ‘talks’ (*takallama*) with the adversary by posing questions and reducing his position to ‘meaningless alternatives.’ He develops his view by abolishing the commonly shared conviction that the art of theology is of foreign bearing. This is clearly indicated in his words: “The thesis we want to defend – that Muslim civilization did not slowly develop the art of theology and especially of *kalām*, but rather grew up with it – sounds too radical to be established by these isolated items. We are too accustomed to the idea that the Arabs ‘of the desert,’ masters of poetry and language but uncultivated in all occupations of an urban society, including theology, started their culture as it were from a vacuum and only gradually severed their inherited predilections. We adhere too stubbornly to the conviction

²²Amin, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p.1-3.

²³Gardet and Anawati, *op. cit.*, p. 46-93.

²⁴Van Ess, J., “The Beginning of Islamic Theology,” in *The Cultural Context in Medieval Learning* ed. J.E. Murdoch & E.D. Sylla (Dordrecht/Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1975) p. 87-111. Van Ess’ view cannot be separated from his identification of the meaning of *kalām* with a narrow sense and a broad one. The narrow sense, he argues, points to “a technique which the *Mutakallimūn* use for defending their conviction.” Here, thus, “*kalām* is identical with an instrument of argumentation, a methodical tool in real discussion and stylistic device for the expansion of ideas.” The broad significance of *kalām*, according to Van Ess, points to “something like ‘Muslim Theology,’ in contrast to philosophy (*falsafā*) or jurisprudence (*fiqh*).” Van Ess discusses this topic in “Disputationpraxis in der Islamischen Theologie: Eine vorläufige Skizze,” in REI, 44 (1976), p. 23-60; and in “Early Development of Kalām,” in *Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society*, ed. G.H.A. Juynboll (Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982), p. 109-123.

²⁵Nasution, Harun., *Teologi Islam: Aliran-aliran Sejarah Analisa Perbandingan* (Jakarta: Yayasan Penerbit Universitas Indonesia, 1972), 2nd ed., p. 1-7.

that literature in Umayyad times was mainly transmitted orally so that it is hard for us to accept readily the possibility of immediate theological production.”²⁶

Based on his enormous study of the formation and the development of Islamic theology especially in the second and third centuries A.H, Van Ess argues that each Muslim thinker seems to have developed an approach of his own when dealing with a number of theological issues. This is due to the fact that these two centuries, Van Ess asserts, formed ‘a period of enormous creativity and imagination,’ in which some original approaches were formulated by Muslim theologians themselves to deal with problems of theology. One of the approaches developed by Muslim thinkers was that dealing with the concept of atomism by which Dirār ibn ‘Amr, who formulated an atomistic approach to reality, preceded the Mu‘tazilite scholar who first introduced atomism into his system, Abū l-Hudhayl.²⁷

Van Ess criticizes the arguments of the scholars who related the development of the concept of atomism to Indian or Greek influence as founded merely on ‘terminological and topological criteria,’ and not on ‘epistemological structures and their underlying axioms.’²⁸

The view that *kalām* developed from within is also stressed by Hans Daiber. In his study of Mu‘ammar b. ‘Abbād al-Sulamī,²⁹ he identifies the development of *kalām* as an “innerislamische Entwicklung.” According to Daiber, theological discussions had thrived in Islam since the beginning, especially in the situation of a coexistence of Muslims, Christians and Jews. This indigenous development, in turn, he maintains, fostered the readiness of Islam to open up to foreign (viz. Greek) influence.³⁰

The most recent view affirming this view was proposed by Haleem, who concludes that *kalām* ‘originated completely in the Islamic environment.’ Asserting his argument, Haleem argues that the earliest concept of *kalām* is to be found in the Koran itself, which deals with theological issues supported by rational proofs. He further maintains that the emergence of theological sects was chiefly the result of differences among Muslims in understanding the Koran and the way their views related to the Qur’anic position. However, Haleem does not reject the influence of foreign elements on the later development of Islamic

²⁶Van Ess, *op. cit.*, (1975) p. 90-1; idem, *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra, Eine Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im fruhen Islam* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991-1998), 6 vols.

²⁷Ibidem.

²⁸See, for instance, his criticism of Peines’ *Beiträge* in Josef van Ess, “60 Years After: Shlomo Pines’s Beiträge and Half a Century of Research on Atomism in Islamic Theology,” *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*, (Jerusalem, 2002), viii, 2, p. 19-41, esp. 25.

²⁹Daiber, Hans, *Das Theologisch-philosophische des Mu‘ammar Ibn ‘Abbad as-Sulamī* (gest. 830 n. Chr.) (Beirut: Orient-Institut der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 1975), p. 6-7.

³⁰“Ein Nachweis von Fremdeinflüssen wird bei jedem einzelnen Theologen etwas anders aussehen. Ihr Anteil wird wesentlich geringer erscheinen bei einer stärkeren Berücksichtigung der innerislamischen Entwicklung und einer Untersuchung der theologischen Struktur.” Daiber, *op. cit.*, (1975), p. 7.

theology. Yet, this only occurred when the Arabs had mixed with other nations and the Greek texts were translated into Arabic.³¹

1.3. Christian Influence

The influence of Christianity on the development of Islamic theology has been dealt with by several Orientalists as early as Von Kremer,³² whose emphasis on the key role of Christianity for the formation of Islamic theology was followed by a number of scholars: Goldziher,³³ De Boer,³⁴ MacDonald,³⁵ Shedd,³⁶ Becker,³⁷ Guillaume,³⁸ Bell,³⁹ Sweetman,⁴⁰ Tritton,⁴¹ Gardet and Anawati,⁴² Seale,⁴³ Allard,⁴⁴ Davidson,⁴⁵ and Nagel.⁴⁶ Before delving into this topic, it should be noted here that most of the works asserting the influence of Christianity on Islamic theology date back to the nineteenth century or the twentieth century in the period before or shortly after the Second World War, seemingly suggesting some bias within the context of the political relation between Muslim countries and the West.

³¹Haleem, M. Abdel, "Early Kalam," in *History of Islamic Philosophy*, S. H. Nasr & O. Leaman (eds.), (London: Routledge, 1996), I, 71-88.

³²Von Kremer, Alfred, *Geschichte der herrschenden Ideen des Islams* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1868), p. 8, 32-3; idem, *Culturgeschichtliche Streifzüge auf dem Gebiete des Islams* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1873), p. 2.

³³Les théologiens mohamétans reconnaissent eux-mêmes sans difficulté que l'Islam a puisé des enseignements dans le christianisme et qu'il n'a pas dédaigné de lui faire des emprunts sur plusieurs points de doctrine théologique.' See Goldziher, I., "Influences chrétiennes dans la littérature religieuse de l'Islam" (RHR, 1888), XVIII, p. 180. In his Vorlesungen, Goldziher, however, associates the origin of the concept of predestination with the concept of pre-Islamic fatalism. See, idem, *Vorlesungen über den Islam* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1910), p. 95.

³⁴De Boer, T.J., *Geschichte der Philosophie im Islam*, (Stuttgart: Fr. Frommanns Verlag, 1901), p. 42-3.

³⁵Macdonald, D.B., *Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory*, (London: Routledge, 1903) p. 132.

³⁶Shedd, W.A., *Islam and the Oriental Churches* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work, 1904), p. 65, 71.

³⁷Becker, C.H., 'Christliche Polemik und islamische Dogmenbildung', *Islamstudien*, (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1924-1932), I, 432-449.

³⁸Guillaume, "Some Remarks on Free Will and Predestination in Islam," JRAS, 1924, p. 43-9.

³⁹Bell, R., *the Origin of Islam in its Christian Environment*, (London: Macmillan, 1926)

⁴⁰Sweetman, J. W., *Islam and Christian Theology*, (London: Lutterworth, 1945-67).

⁴¹Tritton in his "Foreign Influences on Muslim Theology" (BSOAS, vol. 10, 4 (1942), p. 837-842, esp. 842) says that 'the lists of [divine] attributes given by John [of Damascus] and Muslim theologians are practically identical...It is notorious that the founder of Islam owed much to other religions; those who built up its theology were equally in their debt'.

⁴²Gardet and Anawati, *op. cit.*, p. 5, 26, 31-2, 35-7, 41, 45.

⁴³Seale, Morris, *Muslim Theology, a Study of Origins with Reference to the Church Fathers*, (London: Luzac & Co. Ltd, 1964)

⁴⁴Allard, M., *Le problème des attributs divins dans la doctrine d'al-Aṣṭārī et de ses premiers grands disciples* (Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique, 1965).

⁴⁵Davidson, Herbert, "John Philoponus as a Source of Medieval Islamic and Jewish Proofs of Creation," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (1969), 357- 91.

⁴⁶Nagel, Tilman, *Geschichte der islamischen Theologie Von Mohammed bis zur Gegenwart* (München: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1993), p. 11.

Generally speaking, when discussing the influence of Christianity on Islamic theology, these scholars focus on the five following topics: (1) Christian theologians, as the main link in the intellectual and theological encounter between Christianity and Islam, whose works and ideas influenced some Muslim theologians; (2) Some Islamic theological doctrines, which were claimed to have a parallel with, to be influenced by, or even be borrowings from, Christian theological dogmas; (3) Muslim theologians believed to have adopted Christian theological teachings; (4) Adoption of some celebrated Christian figures into the administration of the Umayyad caliphs and their literary, medical, scientific as well as philosophical relation with some Umayyad Caliphs; (5) Damascus which was formerly the Christian capital, where many Christian monasteries were located and the home of several great Church Fathers, became the capital city of the Umayyad dynasty.

To begin with, when dealing with the influence of Christianity on the development of Islamic theology, most of the modern works focus on the role played by prominent Christian theologians, the chief among whom were John of Damascus (d. 749) and his disciple Theodore Abū Qurra (d. 826). These theologians were regarded as the main link in the Christian influence on Islam.

John of Damascus and his disciple, Theodore Abū Qurra, were always associated by modern scholars to the Christian scholars whose works have influenced the Muslim theologians, especially when discussing the question of *qadar* and the createdness of the Koran, two topics dealt with extensively by John of Damascus and Theodore Abū Qurra.⁴⁷

Modern scholars also discuss certain concepts in Islamic theology believed to have been derived from Christian theological ideas. De Boer, for instance, highlights four theological doctrines: (1) free will, (2) the eternity of the Koran, (3) divine attributes and (4) the relation of God to man and the world.⁴⁸ This is confirmed by Becker,⁴⁹ Seale,⁵⁰ and Wolfson.⁵¹

Von Kremer and Seale also mention certain Muslim thinkers who were claimed to have made close contact with, and read Christian polemical works: Ma'bad al-Juhanī, Jahm ibn Ṣafwan, Wāsil ibn Atā, Ja'd ibn Dirhām, Gaylān al-Dimashqī, Ahmād ibn Ḥābiṭ, Faḍl Ḥarbī, Ahmād ibn Mānūs.⁵² Von Kremer records three Mu'tazilite scholars who, according to him, had borrowed from Christianity the concept of justice, which is well reflected in the teaching of Ahmād ibn Ḥābiṭ, Faḍl Ḥarbī and Ahmād ibn Mānūs, who accepted the incarnation of the divine *logos* in a Messiah, from which concept they

⁴⁷Gardet and Anawati, *op. cit.*, p. 37; cf. MacDonald, *Development*, p. 132.

⁴⁸De Boer, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

⁴⁹Becker, *op. cit.*, p. 432-5.

⁵⁰Seale, *op. cit.*, p. 26-7.

⁵¹Evaluating Christian influences on Islamic theology through seven concepts: (1) the eternity of the Koran, (2) free will, (3) predestination, (4) attributes, (5) atomism, (6) causality, and (7) creation. Reading this work, Wolfson seems to suggest that of these seven issues dealt with in Islamic philosophical theology, the first four (nos. 1, 2, 3, 4) were developed by Muslim thinkers under the influence of Christianity, while the issues of atomism and causality, and the creation of the world derived from Hellenism; Judaism shared free will and predestination with Islam. See Wolfson, H.A., *The Philosophy of Kalam* (London, Massachussets & Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976) p. 304-719.

⁵²Von Kremer, *Geschichte*, 32-3.

formulated the pagan doctrine of incarnation. Seale added a number of Muslim scholars who were believed to have adopted certain concepts of Christian dogmas, especially on the predestination and free will. He argued that ‘the first to open discussions at Baṣra on free will was Ma‘bad al-Juhānī.’ Ibn ‘Asākir mentions that a Christian convert, Sūsān, was the first who discussed *qadar*. Ma‘bad al-Juhānī derived from him and Gaylān from Ma‘bad who was executed in 699 in Damascus. The first to play a key role in the development of the Mu‘tazila was Jahm ibn Ṣafwān, who was elaborating Greek Christian theology as taught by the Church Fathers in Alexandria.⁵³

Christian influence on Islamic theology was also seen from two other perspectives: (1) the Umayyad Caliphs’ relation with the Christians in a variety of ways: as administrative advisors (e.g. the family of Manṣūrs), as ‘admirals’ in the newly built Muslim fleet, as poets, such as Akhṭāl, tutors of the princes such as Cosmas the Sicilian, and artists;⁵⁴ (2) the move of the capital city of the Muslim empire by the Umayyad early caliph from Madīna to Damascus, a Christian city and the home of very prominent Christian theologians, such as Clement, Origen, Timothy, John of Damascus, Theodore Abū Qurra, etc.⁵⁵

1.4. Jewish Contributions

The view of Jewish contributions to Islamic theology was proposed explicitly for the first time by Geiger in his provocative work of 1833. We also find this view expressed by Neumark in his *Geschichte* of 1928.⁵⁶ In addition to Koranic exegesis and Tradition,⁵⁷ modern scholars also identified Jewish influence on Islamic theology. Their discussion on this issue, according to Wolfson, revolves mostly around three problems: (1) Anthropomorphism and anti-anthropomorphism; (2) the eternal or created Koran; (3) the dilemma between predestination and free will.⁵⁸

To begin with, when dealing with this issue, Geiger highlighted certain theological concepts of Islam, which according to him, were borrowings from Judaism, such as the concept of *tawḥīd*, the one-ness of God, reward and punishment, the creation of the Earth and the Heaven in seven days, the concept of resurrection of the bodies in the Hereafter, revelation through the angel Gabriel, the notion of the heavenly book, the merit of certain ascetic practices, etc.⁵⁹

⁵³Seale, *op. cit.*, p. 7, 12;

⁵⁴Gardet and Anawati, *op. cit.*, p. 35; Sahas, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

⁵⁵Gardet and Anawati, *op. cit.*, p. 35

⁵⁶Neumark, David, *Geschichte der jüdischen Philosophie des Mittelalters nach Problemen dargestellt* (Berlin: Reimer, 1907-1928), I, 84, 115.

⁵⁷See the discussion on this issue by modern scholars: Munk, S., *Mélanges de philosophie juive et arabe*, (Paris: Franck, 1859); Speyer, Heinrich, *Die Biblischen Erzählungen im Qoran* (Gräfenhainichen: Druck von C. Schulze & Co. GMBH, 1931); Torrey, Ch. C., *The Jewish Foundation of Islam* (New York, 1933); Katsh, Abraham I., *Judaism in Islam* (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1954).

⁵⁸Wolfson, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

⁵⁹Geiger, Abraham, *Was hat Mohammad aus dem Judenthum aufgenommen?* (Leipzig: Verlag von M.W.Kaufmann, 1833, reprinted in 1902), esp. 61-83.

According to Schreiner, the Mu'tazilites owed their two principle doctrines to Judaism, i.e. the concept of the unity of God and that of His Justice. He argued ‘Hingegen lassen sich die Hauptpunkte der mu'tazilitischen Anschauungen in der voraufgegangenen jüdischen Literatur nachweisen und es gibt bestimmte Daten bei arabischen Geschichtsschreibern, welche die Lehren der Mu'taziliten auf das Judenthum zurückführen. Die Hauptpunkte der Lehre der Mu'taziliten bezogen sich auf die Einheit und Gerechtigkeit Gottes.⁶⁰ Schreiner rejects the view that the concept of anthropomorphism, as commonly discussed among the Mu'tazilites, was of Jewish origin.⁶¹ He maintained that anthropomorphism was generally avoided in Judaism (notwithstanding a number of drastic instances in the Babylonian Talmud), as is witnessed by numerous written Jewish sources, from the *Tikkünē sōférím*⁶² until the latest targums.⁶³

Neumark asserted the influence of Judaism on two important doctrines of Islamic theology which were treated philosophically by Muslim theologians: (1) the eternity of the Koran; and (2) predestination. For the first doctrine, he says that the controversy in Islamic theology over whether the Koran was created or not arose under the influence of the controversy in Judaism over the eternity or the createdness of the Torah. Like Schreiner, Neumark also argued that the introduction of the concept of free will which led the controversy among Muslim theologians took place under the influence of Judaism.⁶⁴

1.5. Persian Features

The advocates of Persian influence on Islamic theology highlighted the cultural contact between Islam and the Persian people after the Arab conquest in the fist half of the seventh century.

⁶⁰Schreiner, M., “Der Kalām in der jüdischen Literatur,” *Bericht über die Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums in Berlin* 13 (1895), p. 3.

⁶¹According to Schreiner, Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī's *Tabaqāt al-Kubrā* recorded the biography of Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Jibril al-Kullābī who held debate against Ibn Taymiyya: “thumma afāda al-mudda'i wa asnada anna hādhihi al-maqāla ma'ḥūdhah min talāmidhat al-yahūd wa 'l-mushrikīn wa qalāl al-sābi'īn qāla fainna awwala man hafidha anhu hādhih al-maqālat al-ja'd ibn dirhām wa aḥadhabha anh jahm ibn ṣafwān wa azharahā fanusibat maqālat al-jahmiyya ilayh qāla wa 'l-jahm aḥadhabhā an abbād ibn sam'ān wa aḥadhabhā abbād min tālūt ibn uht labīd ibn aṣṣām wa aḥadhabhā tālūt min labīd al-yahūd al-ladhī sahira al-nabiy ṣalla allāh 'alayh wa sallam qāla wa kāna al-ja'd hadhibh fīma yuqālu min ahl harrān fayuqālu lah ayyuha al-mudda'i inna hādhih al-maqāla ma'ḥudha min talāmidhat al-yahūd qad ḥālafat al-darūra fi dhālikā fa innah mā yuhfā 'an jamī' al-hawāṣ wa kathīr min al-'awwām an al-yahūd mujassima mushabbīha fakayfā yakūn didd al-tajṣīm wa 'l-tashbīh ma'ḥūdhan 'anhūm. Schreiner, *op. cit.*, p. 4, n.2.

⁶²According to Zipor, *Tikkünē sōférím* literally means ‘corrections of scribes.’ This term is used to signify the ‘eighteen’ biblical phrases ‘the root of which go back to tannaitic authorities, where, according to the tradition found in Masoretic notations, the biblical text has been ‘improved’ because of the reverence for God. See Zipor, Moshe A., “Some Notes on the Origin of the Tradition of the Eighteen *Tiqqūnē Sōperīm*,” in *Vetus Testamentum* XLIV, 1 (1994), p. 77-102.

⁶³Schreiner, *op. cit.*, p. 3. I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. J. Kromph, of Leiden University, for his explanation of the concept of *Tikkünē sōférím* and his translation of Schreiner text on this issue.

⁶⁴Neuemark, David, *Geschichte der jüdischen Philosophie des Mittelalters nach Problemen dargestellt* (Berlin: Reimer, 1907-1928), I, 84, 115; Wolfson, *op. cit.*, p. 69-70.

According to Stepaniants, the Persian imprints on Islamic theology can be seen chiefly in the concepts of dualism and eschatology, concepts which also had a profound influence on Judaism and Christianity.⁶⁵ When explaining the influence of Zoroastrianism on Islamic theology, Jackson mentions several narrative accounts from Muslim heresiographers quoting the Prophet as having condemned the Qadarites for their free will doctrine, calling them the Magians of this people. Another account he mentions was recorded by al-Isfarā'inī, who reported that ‘the Prophet applied the name of Magians to the upholders of free will, rightly enough. For the Magians ascribe a part of the things decreed to the Will of God, and another part of it to that of the Devil; and if you are to believe them, the decrees of God come to pass at one time, and at another time those of the Devil.’⁶⁶

Those narratives, Jackson argued, reflect the view prevailing among the 11th and 12th century Muslims, representing their association of the Qadarites with the Zoroastrians. Further Jackson cites statements from a Persian mystical work of the thirteenth century denouncing free will believers as Magians (fire worshippers) and ‘Jabars’, names referring to the Zoroastrians.⁶⁷

However, he admitted that the main link of the association with zoroastrianism of Qadarites by the opponents of the free will doctrine was Ma'bad al-Juhanī (d. 699), who learned the doctrine of *qadar* from Abu Yūnus Snsūyh or Sinbūya, a man of Persian origin called al-Aswārī.⁶⁸ According to Jackson, the attribute of al-Aswārī was referring to the party called asāwirat, ‘who had come from Fārs in Persia and settled in Basra after having lived in Syria’.⁶⁹

While dismissing direct Indian influence on Islamic cosmological theories due to a lack of reliable historical data, Haq asserts the role of Persian dualism in the formation of certain fundamental cosmological and theological doctrines of *kalām*, such as the concept of atomism, God's creation *ex nihilo*, His justice and attributes, the relation between reason and revelation, etc. In his opinion, this Persian influence was made possible through an early contact between the *Mutakallimūn* and the Manichaean dualists of Persia. This contact, in turn, led to the emergence of many polemical *kalām* writings against dualist ideas, as can be obviously read in *Kitāb al-Agānī* of Abu 'l-Faraj al-İsfahānī (d. 357/957), who reported that several disciples of al-Hasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110/728) held debates with those who were accused of disseminating Manicheism. This contact, according to Haq, was also well recorded by a great number of Muslim theologians such as 'Abd al-Jabbār (d. 415/1025), al-Māturīdī (d. 331/942), Ibn al-Nadīm (d. 385/995) and al-Shahrastānī (d. 548/1145). In addition, accounts on the

⁶⁵Stepaniants, M., “The Encounter of Zoroastrianism with Islam,” in *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 52, n. 1 (2002), p. 161-2.

⁶⁶Jackson, A.V. W., *Zoroastrian Studies*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1928), 235-6.

⁶⁷Jackson, *op. cit.*, 237.

⁶⁸Jackson, *op. cit.*, p. 238-9; Mackensen, Ruth S., “Suplementary Notes to ‘Arabic Books and Libraries in the Umayyad Period’” in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, vol. 56, no. 2 (April, 1939), p. 149-57, esp. 150.

⁶⁹Jackson, *op. cit.*, p. 239.

Arabic translations of Manichaean tracts, including the books of Mānī himself, were made by many other Muslim historians and bibliographers.⁷⁰

1.6. Indian Elements

The marks of Indian influence on the origin and the development of *kalām* have been hinted at for the first time by Schmölders, who argued that several Mu'tazilite leaders were well versed in a number of Indian works, especially those composed by the sect of the Summanites, which he ascribes to a certain social group of the Chārvākas in India. The Mu'tazilite leaders were also exposed, Schmölders adds, to works of another Indian sect, beside that of the Summanites.⁷¹ The conjecture on the Indian influence in 1842 made by Schmölders, who was still unsure of the origin of the sect of the Summanites,⁷² had been left vague but in 1910 Horten explicitly confirmed that the Summanite sect originated in India. His argument was based on his study of a report by Ibn al-Murtadā, who recorded that 'Jahm and Mu'ammār held a debate with Summanites in India and also that another debate was held in India between a Summanite and a Muslim'.⁷³

The introduction of the idea of Indian influence on Islamic theology into modern scholarship by Schmölders had significant influence on later studies on this issue. In 1895, Mabilleau in his study of the history of atomism, one of the central issues in Islamic theology, asserted that atomism did not originate from the Greek concept of atomism, but had come from India.⁷⁴ Forty-one years later (in 1936), Pines, following Horten, confirmed Mabilleau's study on the Indian origin of atomism. Pines argued that the concept of atomism in *kalām* contains features that cannot be found in Greek atomism.⁷⁵ These features, Pines maintains, lie in Indian atomism, especially in relation to the view that atoms have no extension.⁷⁶

⁷⁰Haq, Syed Nomanul, "the Indian and Persian Background," in Nasr, *op. cit.*, I, p. 56-70.

⁷¹Augustus Schmölders, *Essai sur les Ecoles philosophiques chez les Arabes, et notamment sur la doctrine d'Algazzali* (Paris: Typographie de Firmin Didot Frères, 1842), 112-5; Wolfson, *op. cit.*, p. 66-7.

⁷²"On dit que la secte des Somanîtes derive de l'Inde, et, bien qu'il ne soit pas ais  de prouver quant   pr sent la v rit  de cette assertion, je ne crois pourtant pas qu'on puisse la r voquer en doute..." See Schmölders, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

⁷³Horten, Max, "Der Skeptizismus der Sumanija nach der Darstellung des Razi, 1209", *Archiv fur Geschichte der Philosophie*, xxiv (1910), 141-66, esp. 142-3, 144, n.6; idem, "Indische Gedanken in der islamischen Philosophie," *Vierteljahrsschrift f r wissenschaftliche Philosophie und Soziologie* (1910), vol. 34, p. 310; idem, *Die philosophischen Systeme der spekulativen Theologen im Islam* (Bonn: Friedrich Cohen, 1912); Wolfson, *op. cit.*, p. 69-70.

⁷⁴Mabilleau, L opold, *Histoire de la philosophie atomistique* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1895), 328; Wolfson, *op. cit.*, p. 69-70.

⁷⁵The conclusion by Pines that the concept of atomism derives from Indian philosophy is diametrically opposed to that of Pretzl who maintained that the early concept of atomism in Islam stemmed from the Greek concept of atomism. See Pretzl, Otto, "Die fr hislamische Atomenlehre: Ein Beitr ge zur Frage  ber die Beziehungen der fr hislamischen Theologie zur griechischen Philosophie," *Der Islam*, 19 (1931), p. 117.

⁷⁶Pines, S., *Beitr ge zur Islamischen Atomenlehre* (Berlin: 1936), p. 102.

Despite the refutation of this view by Massignon in 1910, who remarked that the Indian influence on *kalām* was only based on ‘similarities and isolated coincidents,’⁷⁷ and by Haq in 1996, who questioned such influence due to the lack of reliable historical data,⁷⁸ this theory is still upheld by some scholars, even up to this time. Referring to Herman Jacobi’s article on ‘Atomic Theory (Indian),’⁷⁹ and Keith’s on ‘Buddhist Philosophy in India and Ceylon,’⁸⁰ Macdonald argued in 1928 that some aspects of *kalām* atomism reveal elements of a theory developed by the Indian Buddhist sect of Sautrāntikas, which flourished in the first and second century B.C. According to MacDonald, this Buddhist school formulated a doctrine of time atomism, signifying that time is not ‘infinitely divisible but rather consisted ultimately of discrete atomic moments which cannot be further divided.’⁸¹

According to several modern scholars, the Indian influence on Islamic theology can also be seen in the concept of *ma’nā*. According to Horten, as quoted by Wolfson, Mu‘ammar’s theory of *ma’nā* was formulated under the influence of the Vaiśeṣika category of inherence in Indian philosophy.⁸² Horten’s opinion on this issue was confirmed by Nader, who argued that ‘Indian influence in other branches of knowledge is certain so it is not surprising to find it in philosophy, even if indigested.’⁸³

In addition to the theory of *ma’nā*, Islamic theology was said to owe also to India the concept of reincarnation, which was developed by Ibn Ḥā’it (d. 870), Ḥadathī (d. 870) and Ibn Ayyūb (d. 870) out of the concept of *kumūn* (concealment), under the influence of India. According to this theory, all the living beings had been created perfectly. The good among them were angels; the bad were devils; while those sitting in the middle were sinners, who, through their atonement, followed a series of existences, firstly as animals, then as humans, subsequently as prophets, and finally becoming angels. This chain forms the long development of the souls from the state of concealment.⁸⁴

In 1997, a favourable view asserting this element was expressed by Madjid Fakhry, who argued that the influence of Indians on Islam was not limited to their astronomical and medical ideas, but also included some of their theological contentions. This becomes clear, he argued, from al-Birūnī’s (d. 1048) *Tahqīq mā li l-Hind min Ma’qula* (the Truth about the Beliefs of the Indians). According to

⁷⁷Massignon’s critical remark is as follows: ‘De similitudes et coïncidences isolées... à l’énonciation d’emprunts formels, - il y a loin ! l’esquisse de preuve ébauchée au sujet d’une polémique isolée avec les Somaniyah et à propos de Nazzām semble peu convaincante’. See Massignon, L., “Les systèmes philosophiques des motakallimoūn en Islam selon Horten”, *Der Islam*, vol. 3, (1912), p. 404-9, esp. p. 408; Wolfson, *op. cit.*, p. 68

⁷⁸Haq, *op. cit.*, p. 52-70.

⁷⁹Jacobi, H., “Atomic Theory (Indian)” in J. Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1908-27), vol. 2, p. 199-202.

⁸⁰Keith, A. B., *Buddhist Philosophy in India and Ceylon* (London: Clarendon Press, 1923).

⁸¹MacDonald, D. B. “Continuous Re-creation and Atomic Time in Moslem Scholastic Theology,” *The Muslim World*, v. 18 (1928), 6-28.

⁸²Horten, M., “Die Modus-Theorie des Abū Hāshchim,” ZDMG, (1909), vol. 63, p. 303

⁸³Nader, A.N., *Le système philosophique des Mutazila (Premiers penseurs de l’Islam)* (Beyrouth: l’Institut de Letteres Orientales, 1956), p. 208-210.

⁸⁴Horten, M., “Die Lehre vom Kumūn bei Nazzām († 845),” ZDMG, (1909), vol. 63, p. 780.

Fakhry, in this work al-Bīrūnī referred to a writer of the ninth century, Abu ‘l-‘Abbās al-Iranshahri, who was well-acquainted with Indian religious doctrines.⁸⁵

It is al-Iranshahri, Fakhry maintains, who influenced the great philosopher-physician Abū Bakr al-Rāzī (d. 925), especially in the latter’s concepts of space and time and the atomic composition of bodies. He further argued that even some aspects of Indian atomism appear to have been at the basis of the atomism of *kalām*, one of the cornerstones of Islamic theology.⁸⁶

In 2002, Van Ess evaluated Pines’ *Beiträge*, which asserted the Indian elements of Islamic atomism.⁸⁷ Van Ess objected to Pines’ conclusion, which was merely based on ‘terminological and topological criteria,’ and not on ‘epistemological structures and their underlying axioms.’⁸⁸ According to Van Ess, the concept of atomism did not develop from India and Greece and neither was it Qur’anic. It developed rather from the creative internal discourse of the second and third centuries, in which each Muslim theologian ‘seems to have experimented with an approach of his own.’⁸⁹ The first Muslim thinker who had something of an atomistic approach to reality, according to Van Ess, was Dirār ibn ‘Amr, the predecessor of the scholar who first introduced atomism into his system, Abū ‘l-Hudhayl.⁹⁰

2. Modern Views on Islamic Opposition to Logic and Theology

In marked contrast to the abundance of modern literature on the history of theology and logic in Islam, we can only find a few works dealing with the history of the Muslim opposition to logic and theology. Usually, these works mainly focus either on the opposition to logic or on the opposition to theology. In the following passages, I will deal chronologically with the views of modern scholars who discuss the opposition to logic and theology respectively.

2.1. Modern Views on the Islamic Opposition to Logic

2.1.1. Goldziher (1916)

Goldziher was the first of the modern writers to draw our attention to the Muslim opposition to logic.⁹¹ He underlines that logic was already condemned by a scholar as early as Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, the seventh *imām* of the Shi‘ite *Ithnā*

⁸⁵Fakhry, Majid, *A Short Introduction to Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Mysticism*, (Oxford: Oneworld, 1997), p. 10.

⁸⁶Ibidem.

⁸⁷Van Ess, *op. cit.*, (2002) p. 19-41.

⁸⁸Van Ess, *op. cit.*, (2002) p. 25.

⁸⁹Van Ess, *op. cit.*, (2002) p. 28.

⁹⁰Ibidem.

⁹¹Goldziher, I., “Die Stellung der alten Orthodoxie zu den antiken Wissenschaften,” written in Berlin in 1916. This article is found in *Gesammelte Schriften* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1970) vol. V, p. 357-400. For this discussion, I rely on an English translation of Goldziher’s article by Merlin L. Swartz, “The Attitude of Orthodox Islam toward the ‘Ancient Sciences’” in *Studies on Islam* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), p. 185-215.

'Ashariyya (d.148/764), to whom the following words are ascribed: “People will occupy themselves with logic until they even question the belief in God. If you hear something of that kind, say: ‘there is no god except the unique One; there is nothing like unto Him.’”⁹² According to Goldziher, al-Ṣādiq was hostile to logic because he understood that Aristotle’s method of proof on ‘the validity of religious doctrines’ would result in grave evil.⁹³

He then enumerated a number of scholars of various denominations, who opposed “the sciences of the ancients” in general or logic in particular: The Shafi‘ite al-Mawardi (d. 450/1059), Ibrāhīm b. Mūsā (d. 790/1389), the Sūfī al-Suhrawardī (d. 584/1190),⁹⁴ the Shafi‘ite al-Dhababī (d. 748/1348), the Shi‘ite Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbahṭī (d. c. 310/922), the Shafi‘ite Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Shārazūrī (d. 643/1246), the Shafi‘ite Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 771/1370), the Hanbalite Ibn Taymiyya (d. 729/1329) and the Shafi‘ite Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūtī (d. 909/1505).⁹⁵ According to Goldziher, antagonism to the study of logic increased after al-Gazālī (d. 505/1111).⁹⁶

The sources on which Goldziher relied are: *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* by al-Kulaynī (d. 329/940), *Kitāb Ṭabaqāt al-Umam* by Ibn Sa‘īd (d. 683/1286), *al-Kāmil fi l-Ta’rīh* by Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630/1233), *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* by Yāqūt al-Hamawī (d. 624/1229), *al-Futūḥat al-Makkiya* by Ibn al-‘Arabī, *Wafayāt al-A‘yān* by Ibn Hallikān, *Ṭabaqāt al-Šāfi‘iyya* and *Mu‘id al-Ni‘am wa Mubīd al-Niqām* by Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Mufassirīn* by al-Suyūtī and *Nayl al-Ibtihāj* by Aḥmad Bābā al-Sūdānī.

However, Goldziher’s argument on this issue is challenged by el-Rouayheb,⁹⁷ who examines Goldziher’s argument, confirmed by Makdisi,⁹⁸ that opposition to logic was already manifest in the 2nd/8th century and increased in intensity in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, when al-Shārazūrī and Ibn Taymiyya composed works in which they censured it. El-Rouayheb rejects Makdisi’s suggestion that opposition to logic was facilitated by the establishment of *madrasas* that were opposed to Greek learning. El-Rouayheb also questions

⁹²Goldziher, *op. cit.*, (1981) p. 198.

⁹³Goldziher, *op. cit.*, (1981) p. 199.

⁹⁴Madkour seems to have based his view on the fact that al-Suhrawardī had composed *Kashf al-Faḍā’iḥ al-Yūnaniyya* to condemn Greek philosophy. This view is also confirmed by Goldziher, *op. cit.*, (1981) p. 188 and ‘Alī Husayn al-Jābirī (see *al-Fikr al-Salafī ‘Ind al-Šī‘a al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyya Dirāsa Tahlīliyya li Mawqif al-Fikr al-Salafī fi l-Islām ‘Umūman wa ‘Ind al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyya ‘alā Wajh al-Ḥuṣūṣ min Mantiq wa Falsafat al-Yūnān* (Beirut: Manshūrāt ‘Uwaidāt, 1977), p. 127. n. 1). In contrast, Hartmann argues that this work was composed by al-Suhrawardī as politico-religious propaganda in favour of the Abbasid Caliph, al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh against “ärgste Staatsfeinde geltenden Philosophen” and against the Muslims who were occupied by the philosophy. However H.Ritter, according to Hartmann, suggests that this work was composed to serve al-Nāṣir’s propaganda against the Isma‘ilites. See Hartmann, Angelika, *an-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh (1180-1225): Politik, Religion, Kultur in der späten Abbāsidenzzeit* (Berlin & New York: Walter de gruyter, 1975), p. 250-4.

⁹⁵Goldziher, *op. cit.*, (1981) p. 201-8.

⁹⁶Goldziher, *op. cit.*, (1981) p. 204.

⁹⁷Khaled el-Rouayheb, ‘Sunnī Muslim Scholars on the Status of Logic, 1500-1800,’ ILS 11, 2 (2004), 213-32.

⁹⁸Goldziher, *op. cit.*, (1981), p.198, 201-8; Makdisi, *op. cit.*, (1990), p. 282-3.

Goldziher's suggestion that hostility to logic was found predominantly among Sunni scholars, 'at least between the endorsement of the discipline by Abū Ḥāmid al-Gazālī (d. 505/1111) and the rise of the Salafiyya in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.'⁹⁹

El-Rouayheb bases his argument on discussions concerning the status of logic by Sunni scholars in the period between 1500 and 1800. He argues that 'hostility to logic was a minority position in scholarly circles throughout this period.' Since 'many of the scholars of this period regularly invoked earlier authorities in support of their position,' el-Rouayheb argues, Goldziher's suggestion that hostility to logic was a predominant view amongst Sunni scholarship, especially between the 12th and 14th centuries, is no longer tenable.¹⁰⁰

2.1.2. Madkour (1974)

As far as the opposition to logic is concerned, Madkour¹⁰¹ suggested that logic, i.e. the logic of Aristotle, was subjected to the objections of scholars of various backgrounds. Two grand savants, Madkour argues, one a mystic and the other a traditionist, al-Suhrawardī¹⁰² (d. 584/1190) and Ibn Taymiyya (d. 729/1329), can be considered as fervent critics of logic who aimed at deconstructing its foundation. Ja'far al-Ṣādiq (d. 148/764) is also referred to by Madkour as having opposed theological speculation based on logic. Al-Shāfi'i (d. 203/820), Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 641/1245) and his disciple al-Nawawī (d. 674/1277) are highlighted as having an unfavourable attitude toward logic as well.¹⁰³ At last, Madkour asserts the influence of the great Shi'ite thinker of the tenth century, Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbahṭī (d. ca.310/922) on Ibn Taymiyya in the latter's aim of demolishing the principles of Aristotelian logic.¹⁰⁴ In discussing the opposition to logic of certain scholars, Madkour frequently refers to *Sawn al-Mantiq* by al-Suyūṭī (4 times) and *Manāhij al-Baḥth* by 'Alī Shāmī al-Nashshār, the editor of *Sawn al-Mantiq* (twice), *A'yān al-Shī'a* by al-'Āmilī (once), *al-Radd 'ala 'l-Mantiqiyyīn* by Ibn Taymiyya (8 times) and *Fatāwā Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ* (once).

2.1.3. Hartmann (1975)

In her discussion of "the Measures against any occupation with Greek Philosophy," Hartmann shows how the 34th Abbasid caliph, who was generally

⁹⁹On this issue, see my article, "A Statistical Portrait of the Resistance to Logic by Sunni Muslim Scholars Based on the Works of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (849-909/1448-1505)," ILS 15 (2008), 250-267, esp. 252-3; El-Rouayheb, *op. cit.*, esp. p. 213-6; Goldziher, *op. cit.*, (1981), p. 198-9.

¹⁰⁰Ali, *op. cit.*, (2008), p. 253; El-Rouayheb, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

¹⁰¹Madkour, I., "La Logique d'Aristote chez les Motakallimīn," in Mohaghegh, Mahdi and T. Izutsu, *Collected Texts and Papers on Logic and Language* (Tehran: The Tehran University Press, 1974) p. 29-46.

¹⁰²Madkour underlines the fact that al-Suhrawardī critically remarked that Aristotle's theory on definition is difficult to applyd, because it is based on the essence and quiddity which belong to the metaphysical notions. See Madkour, *op. cit.*, p. 42. *Rashf al-Naṣā'ih al-Imāniyya wa Kashf al-Faḍā'ih al-Yūnāniyya* was edited and published in Cairo in 2004 by Dr. Aisha al-Mannā'ī.

¹⁰³Madkour, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

¹⁰⁴Madkour, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

known as *mujtahid* and *muḥaddith*, al-Nāṣir li ‘l-Dīn Allāh (d. 623/1225), took at least three measures against Greek philosophy by (1) exterminating philosophical literature; (2) burning libraries housing Hellenistic works; and (3) denouncing the prominent figures claimed to be occupied by Greek learning.¹⁰⁵ Al-Nāṣir issued an order to burn libraries which housed works of Ibn Sīnā. Due to their collections of Hellenistic works, according to Hartmann, a private library of Rukn al-Dīn ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb ibn ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlī, a nephew of a prominent Hanbalite scholar, ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlī, was burnt. The works believed to be preserved in the library, according to Hartmann, were those of Ibn Sīnā, i.e., *Kitāb al-Shifā’*, *Kitāb al-Najāt*, the Encyclopaedia of the *Iḥwān al-Ṣafā’*,¹⁰⁶ works on philosophy, logic, astronomy, treatises on *nīrānjiyāt* (trick and talisman)¹⁰⁷ as well as guides for worshipping the stars.¹⁰⁸

Several notable scholars during al-Nāṣir’s rule, according to Hartmann, also lost their professorial chair in the state-funded institution of learning, due to their covert occupation with philosophy. Hartmann mentions the *Faqīh al-Mūjir* (d. 595/1198), who was forced to leave the Niẓāmiyya college and Baghdad for Damascus and Ḥurāsān.¹⁰⁹ Another prominent scholar who lost his official position, according to Hartmann, was al-Faḥr Gulām ibn al-Munā, known as Ibn al-Māshiṭa (d. 610/1213), who was intensively occupied with Greek learning. According to Hartmann, Ibn Māshiṭa in his work, *Nawāmis al-Anbiyā*, claimed that the prophets were men knowledgeable of Greek philosophy.¹¹⁰

Hartmann also dealt with the hostile attitude of Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar al-Suhrawardī al-Shāfi‘ī (w. 632/1234), the chief judge appointed by al-Nāṣir himself. Al-Suhrawardī’s unfavourable attitude toward logic was well known for his condemnation of the pantheist Ibn ‘arabī, who established an epistemological relation between the doctrine of *taṣawwuf* and some elements derived from Greek philosophy. Besides, al-Suhrawardī (d. 632/1234) was said to have composed a polemical work against Greek sciences and philosophy, *Rashfu ‘l-Nasā’ih al-Īmāniyya wa Kashfu ‘l-Fadā’ih al-Yūnāniyya*, in order to refute apologetico-dialectical arguments of theology and *falsafā* along with their Greek sources.¹¹¹ Under the commission of al-Nāṣir, Hartmann says, al-Suhrawardī even sunk volumes of Ibn Sīnā’s works.¹¹²

¹⁰⁵See Hartmann, *op. cit.*, (1975), p. 256-62; this topic has also been dealt with by Ali, Mufti, “Aristotelianisme dalam Kaca Mata Para Tokoh Abad Tengah Penentang Logika,” *Alqalam*, IAIN Sultan Maulana Hasanudin, Serang Banten, XXIV, 3 (September-Desember, 2007), p. 318-339.

¹⁰⁶The Epistles of the *Iḥwān al-Ṣafā’*, according to Rescher, comprises 52 treatises which deal with mathematics, natural sciences, metaphysics, mysticism, astrology, magic, etc. See Rescher, Nicholas, *The Development of Arabic Logic* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964), p. 146.

¹⁰⁷Hartmann refers to this term as “trick und talismane.” For elaborate discussion on this term, see Ullmann, Manfred, *Die Natur- und Geheimwissenschaften im Islam* (Köln & Leiden: E.J Brill, 1972), hal. 360;

¹⁰⁸Hartmann, *op. cit.*, (1975), p. 256.

¹⁰⁹Hartmann, *op. cit.*, (1975), p. 260-1.

¹¹⁰Hartmann, *op. cit.*, (1975), p. 262.

¹¹¹Ibidem.

¹¹²Hartmann, *op. cit.*, (1975), p. 255,

According to Hartmann, the hostility toward things ‘Greek’ did not stop at the period of al-Nāṣir but continued under the rule of the Caliph al-Mustanṣid (d. 884/1479) who also issued an order to burn Ibn Sīnā’s works and the Epistles of the Iḥwān al-Ṣafā.¹¹³

2.1.4. Al-Nashshār (1978)

A discussion of how Greek logic, i. e. Aristotelian logic, was rejected by Muslims can be found in al-Nashshār’s *Maṇāḥij*.¹¹⁴ Al-Nashshār started his discussion with the problem whether Greek logic and philosophy were ‘made to enter’ (*idḥāl*) or ‘entered themselves’ (*duḥūl*) into the Islamic world. Based on his own view that the inner structure of Islamic culture had no need whatsoever of Greek logic and philosophy, he maintained that Greek logic and philosophy were ‘made to enter’ into the Islamic world,¹¹⁵ where one finds that the *mutakallimūn* and the jurists of the first generation did not accept Aristotelian logic, which was also opposed by the traditionalists.

Rejecting the idea that the legal theories of the usulists were influenced by Aristotelian logic, al-Nashshār suggests that the principle of the *uṣūl*¹¹⁶ was based on *al-qiyās al-lugawī*, whose most important authorities were al-Halil and Sibawayhi.¹¹⁷ In formulating his legal theory, al-Shāfi‘ī, for instance, did not get any benefit from Aristotelian logic. He says, this was because of his conviction that Aristotelian logic was based on the particular characteristics of the Greek language, which, according to him, were totally different from those of Arabic.¹¹⁸

Al-Nashshār also interestingly discussed how logic was opposed not only by the Traditionalists, but also by the “Rationalist” group of Muslims, i.e. the *mutakallimūn*. The hostile attitude of the traditionalists towards logic was represented by the fact that when al-Gazālī adopted Aristotelian logic in his legal theory, he was criticized severely by a number of prominent figures, such as Abū Ishaq al-Marjānānī, Abū al-Wafā’ b. ‘Uqayl (d. 513/1119), al-Qushayrī, al-Turtūshī (d. 520/1127), al-Māzirī, Ibn al-Ṣalāh (d. 643/1246) and al-Nawawī (d. 631/1234).¹¹⁹ The rejection of the *mutakallimūn* of Aristotelian logic was reflected by their conviction that it contained certain metaphysical premises, which were substantially against the teaching of the Koran, and certain physical premises, which could not be accepted whatsoever by the Muslims.¹²⁰

¹¹³Hartmann, *op. cit.*, (1975), p. 256.

¹¹⁴See al-Nashshār, ‘Alī Sāmī, *Maṇāḥij al-Baḥth ‘Inda Mufakkirī al-Islām* (Cairo: Dār al-Ma‘ārif, 1978), 4th ed. p. 143-4.

¹¹⁵“*Intiqāl al-falsafa wa ‘l-manṭiq al-yūnānī ila ‘l-‘alam al-islāmī intiqāl idḥāl...*” Al-Nashshār, *op. cit.*, p.16.

¹¹⁶Al-Nashshār identifies *al-uṣūl* as having two significances; a narrow and a broad one: The narrow significance refers to “*manhaj al-baḥth ‘ind al-faqīh aw huwa manṭiq masā’ilih*,” while the broad one is “*qānūn ‘āsim lidhīhn al-faqīh min al-haṭa’ fi ‘l-istiqlāl ‘ala ‘l-ahkām*.” Al-Nashshār, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

¹¹⁷Al-Nashshār, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

¹¹⁸Al-Nashshār, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

¹¹⁹Al-Nashshār, *op. cit.*, p. 143-4.

¹²⁰Al-Nashshār, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

2.1.5. Al-Tabāṭabā’ī (1979)¹²¹

When discussing ‘the introduction of logic into Muslim world,’ al-Tabāṭabā’ī lists the proponents and the opponents of Aristotelian logic. Referring to al-Suyūṭī’s *Sawn al-Mantiq* and his *fatwā*, Ibn Qayyim’s *Miftāḥ Dār al-Sa‘āda*, and Abū al-Najā’ al-Fārid’s *Kasr al-Mantiq*, al-Tabāṭabā’ī further mentions some scholars who opposed Aristotelian logic: Abū Sa‘īd al-Sīrāfī al-Nahwī, al-Qādī Abū Bakr b. al-Tayyib, al-Qādī ‘Abd al-Jabbār, al-Jubbā’ī and his son, Abū al-Ma‘ālī, Abū al-Qāsim al-Anṣārī, al-Baqillānī, Abū l-‘Abbās al-Nāshī’, al-Nawbahī, Abū Sa‘īd Abū ‘l-Hayr al-Mīhanī (d. 440/1048), Ibn Taymiyya, Sirāj al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī, al-Suyūṭī and Abū al-Najā’ al-Fārid.¹²²

As far as the opposition to logic by each of the scholars mentioned above is concerned, referring to Ibn Taymiyya’s *al-Radd*, al-Tabāṭabā’ī, first of all, discussed al-Nawbahī’s criticism of *shakl al-qiyās* (form of analogy). According to al-Tabāṭabā’ī, al-Nawbahī’s criticism of Aristotelian logic was recorded in his no longer extant work, *al-Radd ‘alā Ahl al-Mantiq*, some of whose topics were preserved by Ibn Taymiyya’s *al-Radd*.¹²³ Referring to al-Tawhīdī’s *al-Imtā’*, he further discussed the debate between al-Sīrāfī and Mattā b. Yūnus.¹²⁴ He then recorded the logical dispute between Ibn Sīnā, the philosopher, and Abū Sa‘īd Abū ‘l-Hayr al-Mīhanī, the Ṣūfī, who criticized Ibn Sīnā’s use of rational sciences for finding the truths.¹²⁵ Criticizing the epistemological foundation of logic, al-Mīhanī, according to al-Tabāṭabā’ī argued: *inna ʔ-burhān al-‘aqlī la ‘tibāra lah li annah yuthbit buṭānah min tariq al-burhān al-‘aqlī wa hādhā al-shakl min al-istidlāl laysa min mafād al-burhān bal huwa ḥura waḍīha min al-mugālata* (rational demonstration is nothing, since its invalidity is confirmed by way of rational demonstration. This kind of deduction is not a result of (proper) demonstration but represents clearly its confusion).¹²⁶

According to al-Tabāṭabā’ī, al-Fārid’s opposition to logic, as discussed in *Kasr al-Mantiq*, lies in the concept of analogy which ‘neither gives us any new knowledge nor unravels the complexity or reveals a secret from its covert form.’¹²⁷ Ibn Taymiyya’s systematical criticism of logic was discussed comprehensively by al-Tabāṭabā’ī as well.¹²⁸ Finally, al-Tabāṭabā’ī’s discussion of the opposition to logic ended up with his account of Ibn Ḥaldūn’s criticism toward logic asserting: *al-mantiq aw al-‘aql fi ʔ-ulūm al-ilahiyya lā yufidu shay'an wa la ‘stī'māla lah fi majālihā* (logic or reason made use of in religious sciences does not bear any benefit nor is there any need to use it in the scope of their study).¹²⁹

¹²¹I would like to express my gratitude to Samir Kaddouri, Rabat, who drew my attention to a work of Muṣṭafā al-Tabāṭabā’ī, *al-Mufakkirūn al-Muslimūn fī Muwājāhat al-Mantiq al-Yūnānī Naqd ʻulamā’ al-Muslimīn li Mantiq Aristū wa Muwāzanatih bi Mantiq al-Falāsifa al-Garbiyyīn*, (Beyrut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 11410/1990), originally published in Persian in 1399/1979.

¹²²Al-Tabāṭabā’ī, *op. cit.*, p. 19-20.

¹²³Al-Tabāṭabā’ī, *op. cit.*, p. 32-33.

¹²⁴Al-Tabāṭabā’ī, *op. cit.*, p. 37-70.

¹²⁵Al-Tabāṭabā’ī, *op. cit.*, p. 71-80.

¹²⁶Al-Tabāṭabā’ī, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

¹²⁷“anna ʔ-qiyās lā yu‘tinā āyat ma‘rifā jadīda wa lā yaḥillu mushkilan wa lā yakshif al-sirra ‘an amr ḥafīyy...” Al-Tabāṭabā’ī, *op. cit.*, p. 81-8.

¹²⁸Al-Tabāṭabā’ī, *op. cit.*, p. 89-116.

¹²⁹Al-Tabāṭabā’ī, *op. cit.*, p. 117-125.

2.1.6. Hallaq (1993)

The opposition of a particular historical figure, i.e. Ibn Taymiyya, against logic is the central issue in Hallaq's introduction of his translation of al-Suyūṭī's *Jahd al-Qariha fī Tajarid al-Naṣīḥa* (the Exertion of Effort in Divesting the *Naṣīḥa*).¹³⁰ Hallaq argues that Ibn Taymiyya fought against everything that directly or indirectly derived from what was termed the “ancient sciences” (*‘ulūm al-awā’iḥ*), especially Aristotelian logic. Ibn Taymiyya criticized logic because, Hallaq maintains, ‘it brought under its wings not only Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, Ibn Sīnā and the rest of the Arabic philosophers, but also the pantheistic Sufis, the Shi‘is, and the speculative theologians (*ahl al-kalām*).’¹³¹ Ibn Taymiyya’s unrelenting attack against the philosophers, i. e. logicians, Hallaq says, was, however, double edged. On the one hand, by refuting philosophical logic, he advanced his critique of the metaphysical doctrines of *falsafa*, and, on the other, by undermining logic in general and the realist theories of essences and universals in particulars, he sought to shake the dogmatic foundation of mystical pantheism.¹³² Hallaq interestingly maintains that despite Ibn Taymiyya’s intense disapproval of Greek logic, he insisted on the proposition that the categorical syllogism was formally impeccable.

Determining what was Ibn Taymiyya’s real attitude towards logic, Hallaq conclusively states that for Ibn Taymiyya the challenge facing the logicians lies not in an investigation of forms, figures, and moods but rather in arriving at the truth and certainty of propositions. The truth and certainty of propositions, as it is stated by Hallaq in his concluding passages, could not be established by simple human minds but should be based on revealed knowledge, which is conveyed to mankind by the prophets.¹³³

Hallaq also mentions that a number of scholars of various theological denominations have written treatises to refute either entirely or partially formal logic and to condemn the logicians. He says that the Mu‘tazilite poet and thinker Abu ’l-‘Abbās al-Nāshi’ al-Akbar, known as Ibn al-Shirshīr (d. 293/905), was the first who refuted logic. The Shī‘ī thinker Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbaḥtī (d. ca. 310/922), the author of *Kitāb al-Arā’ wa ’l-Diyānāt* and *al-Radd ‘alā Ahl al-Manṭiq*, which is no longer extant, was another scholar mentioned by Hallaq as a fervent opponent to logic. The grammarian Abū Sa‘īd al-Sirāfī (d. 368/979) was cited as the one who launched an attack against the philosopher-logician Mattā b. Yūnus (d. 328/940). Besides, he suggests that the Ash‘arite theologian Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī, in his treatise *al-Daqā’iq*, is said to have argued against the philosophers’ logic. At last, Hallaq indicates the unfavourable attitude of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1245) with his well-known *fatwā*, and that of the unknown Abū al-Najā al-Farīd (?) in one of his treatises.¹³⁴

¹³⁰Hallaq, W.B., *Ibn Taymiyya Against the Greek Logicians* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), p. xi-lvi.

¹³¹Hallaq, *op. cit.*, p. xiv.

¹³²Hallaq, *op. cit.*, p. xxiv.

¹³³Hallaq, *op. cit.* p. xxxix

¹³⁴See Hallaq, *op. cit.*, p. xlii-xlv. In spite of the fact that Hallaq does not mention any individual treatise which al-Farīd wrote against logic, it may be mentioned here that it

2.1.7. Endress (1987)

As has been mentioned elsewhere,¹³⁵ Goldziher associates the alleged decline of Muslim civilization with Muslim resistance to the ‘Greek sciences,’ one of which was, of course, logic; Makdisi equates the resistance to logic with the emergence of *madrasas*. Similarly, Endress, according to Brentjes, attributes the decline of Muslim civilization after the 13th century to four factors which implicitly reflect a resistance to logic: (1) the dichotomy between the ancient ‘rational’ sciences and religious and legal sciences; (2) the marginal position of the ancient sciences in the Muslim world; (3) ‘the rejection of innovation as a positive value for Muslim society and the insistence on social practice based on authoritative learning,’ and (4) the replacement of philosophy by ‘the canon of religious duties as the ideal of salvation’.¹³⁶

In her discussion of the relation between power and the *madrasa vis a vis* orthodoxy and ‘the ancient sciences,’¹³⁷ Brentjes challenges Endress’ thesis in the spirit of Goldziher and Makdisi by claiming that the negative and hostile attitudes toward philosophy and logic ‘did not dominate the intellectual atmosphere from the 5th/11th century onwards.’¹³⁸ Referring to Chamberlain, Brentjes also rejects the *madrasas* as ‘the core institution of Muslim legal education which possessed a formalized curriculum and excluded the ancient sciences and rational theology’.¹³⁹

2.1.8. Van Koningsveld (1998)

Van Koningsveld proposes a new interpretation of the dream of al-Ma’mūn and of the stories of the importation of Greek books from Byzantium. The interpretation of this dream and stories by Muslim historians, biographers, and jurists give birth to two Muslim literatures showing two tendencies representing their opposite attitude toward Greek sciences: (1) the ‘Ma’mūn cycle,’ representing a favourable attitude to Greek sciences, and (2) the “Umar cycle,” showing hostility to Greek sciences.¹⁴⁰

The opposition to logic, Van Koningsveld suggests, is reflected in certain aspects by the hostile attitudes of religious scholars of early Islam to Greek

probably points to *Kasr al-Manṭiq*, which has been studied by Z. A. Baqir (a lecturer at Gajah Mada University, Yogyakarta Indonesia) in his M.A. thesis, *The Problem of Definition in Islamic Logic: A Study of Abū al-Najā al-Farid’s Kasr al-Manṭiq in Comparison with Ibn Taimiyah’s Kitāb al-Radd ‘ala ’l-Manṭiqiyyīn* (Kuala Lumpur: ISTAC, 1998), 89 pp.

¹³⁵See p. 15-6; Read also my discussion in ILS, *op. cit.*, 252-3; Brentjes, *op. cit.*, p. 3-4.

¹³⁶Endress, G., “Die wissenschaftliche Literatur,” in *Grunriß der Arabischen Philologie*, ed. H. Gätje, (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1987), vol. 2, 8, p. 400-473.

¹³⁷Brentjes, Sonja, “Orthodoxy”, *Ancient Sciences, Power, and the Madrasa (“college”) in Ayyubid and early Mamluk Damascus* (International Workshop Experience and Knowledge Structures in Arabic and Latin Sciences Organized by Muhammad Abattouy and Paul Weinig, Max Planck Institute for the History of Science Berlin, December 16-17, 1996), 3; Ali, *op. cit.*, (2008), p. 252

¹³⁸Brentjes, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

¹³⁹Brentjes, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

¹⁴⁰Van Koningsveld, *op. cit.*, p. 355-366.

sciences in general and to philosophy and logic in particular.¹⁴¹ Though indirect, their opposition to logic can be associated, he suggests, with their exhortation of the destruction of the “ancient books” which contain the “ancient sciences”, among which are logic and philosophy. In sum, he says that the unfavourable attitude of some of the early authorities in Islam toward logic was closely connected to their opposition to things Greek, which was specifically reflected by their “suspicion and overt enmity” toward the “Books of the Infidels” (the Books of the Greeks).¹⁴²

Relying on, among others, *Ihtilāf al-Fugahā'* by al-Tabarī and *al-Mi'yār al-Mu'rib wa 'l-Jāmi' al-Mugrib* by al-Wansharīsī, several early leading scholars are listed by Van Koningsveld to have opposed the “Books of the Infidels”: Al-Awzā'i (d. 159/774), Mālik b. Anas (d. 178/795) and al-Shāfi'i (d. 203/820).¹⁴³ Referring to *Tabaqāt al-Umam* by Ṣā'id al-Andalusī, Van Koningsveld also deals with al-Manṣūr b. Abī 'Āmir's (d. 392/1002) incineration of the books of philosophy and logic.¹⁴⁴

2.1.9. Griffel (2000)

Griffel's discussion of the opposition to logic focuses on the notorious *fatwā* of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1245), who maintained that being occupied with learning and teaching logic is not allowed by the Law-giver, by the Companions, the Followers and by the leading scholars qualified to undertake *ijtihād*. Griffel understands the issuance of this *fatwā* from the context of the Muslim opposition to the influence of Greek philosophy on the works of Muslim scholars. Griffel further argues that this *fatwā* not only forms evidence of the existence of the study of philosophy in the first half of 8th/13th century, but also constitutes the peak of the opposition to the philosophers, which had already been undertaken by al-Gazālī with his *Tahāfut al-Falāsifa* more than one hundred-fifty years earlier.¹⁴⁵

Interestingly, Griffel also proposes another *fatwā* of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ as illustrative of his unfavourable attitude toward logic in particular and Greek philosophy in general. Referring to al-Qal'aī's second edition of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's *fatwā*, Griffel records the *fatwā* as follows: “Es ist die Pflicht des Herrschers, die Muslime vor dem Übel dieser Peripatetiker zu beschützen, sie aus den Medresen zu entfernen und zu verbannen und die Beschäftigung mit ihrer Disziplin zu bestrafen. Um den Brand, den diese Leute legen, zu löschen und die Überreste der Philosophie und der Philosophen zu vertilgen, soll der Herrscher alle, die öffentlich ihr Bekenntnis zu den Glaubensüberzeugungen der Philosophen kundtun, unter das Schwert tun oder sie dazu auffordern, zum Islam überzutreten. (...) Wer diese Pflicht zu erfüllen anstrebt, der muß jene, die von den Leuten der Philosophie in den Medresen als Lehrer tätig sind und über Philosophie schreiben und sie rezitieren, ihres Amtes entheben, sie dann einsperren und ihnen seinen Standpunkt aufzwingen. Für den Fall, daß jemand behauptet, er glaube nicht an ihr Bekenntnis, und dabei der Lüge überführt wird, so ist der (beste) Weg, ein Übel auszureißen, indem man es seiner Wurzel ausreißt

¹⁴¹Van Koningsveld, *op. cit.*, p. 345-370.

¹⁴²Van Koningsveld, *op. cit.*, p. 350.

¹⁴³Ibidem.

¹⁴⁴Van Koningsveld, *op. cit.*, p. 354-5.

¹⁴⁵Griffel, *op. cit.*, p. 354-8.

und die Wiedereinstellung eines solchen als Lehrer gehört zu den größten Vergehen.”¹⁴⁶

According to Griffel, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s adamant criticism of logic is well reflected in his *fatwā*, which prohibits people from using philosophical terms, such as *al-hadd* (definition) and *al-burhān* (demonstration). Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ even condemned, Griffel maintains, those who read a work of Aristotelian bearing, like *Kitāb al-Shifā’* of Ibn Sīnā. Muslim scholars (*‘ulamā’*) and Sufis will lose their authority as soon as they read Ibn Sīnā’s works.¹⁴⁷

2.2. Modern Views on the Islamic Opposition to (Philosophical) Theology

2.2.1. Makdisi (1962, 1971, 1986, 1990)

A penetrating analysis of how “philosophical theology” was opposed by the Traditionalists was given by Makdisi in several of his works. In his opinion, the opposition against theology was embodied by a form of scholastic movement, “a movement of schools, guild schools of legal science,” which was prepared by the efforts of two leaders, al-Shāfi‘ī (d. 203/820) and Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 245/855), whose influence against *kalām* and philosophy remained throughout Muslim history. This movement was brought into existence, he states, by the movement of juridical theology against the theology of *kalām*, in which *al-Risāla* was composed by al-Shāfi‘ī as its religious manifesto.¹⁴⁸ Like al-Shāfi‘ī, the first champion of the traditionalists whose “career signaled the first triumph over rationalism and whose life was imbued with a deep sense of submission to the Koran, the Word of God, the *hadīth* and the deeds of the Prophet,” Ahmad b. Ḥanbal with his resistance against the Great Inquisition signaled the second defeat of Rationalism.¹⁴⁹

The traditionalist triumph over Rationalism does not end up with Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, it continues through two other landmarks, the defection of al-Ash‘arī (d. ca. 324/935) from Mu‘tazilism to Hanbalism and the promulgation of the Traditionalist creed¹⁵⁰ by the Caliph al-Qādir (381-422/991-1031).¹⁵¹ The rise of legal studies and institutions such as Mosque-Inn (*masjid-ḥān*) college and Madrasa, in which they were taught and in which *kalām* and philosophy were not admitted as part of the curriculum,¹⁵² is associated by Makdisi with the effort by the Traditionalists in their respective “guilds of law,” the rise of which was the effect of the rise of such institutions, to preserve their dominance over the Rationalists.

¹⁴⁶Griffel, *op. cit.*, p. 356-7.

¹⁴⁷Griffel, *op. cit.*, p. 354.

¹⁴⁸Makdisi, G., *The Rise of Humanism in Classical Islam and the Christian West: With Special Reference to Scholasticism* (Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 1990), p. 3.

¹⁴⁹Makdisi, *op. cit.*, (1990), p. 5.

¹⁵⁰The contents of this creed, according to Makdisi, was directed against the anthropomorphists, the Karramiya, the Shi‘a, the Ash‘ariyya and the Mu‘tazila. *The Rise*, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

¹⁵¹Makdisi, *op. cit.*, (1990), p. 5-8.

¹⁵²Makdisi, G. “Law and Traditionalism in the Institutions of Learning of Medieval Islam” in *Theology and Law in Islam*, ed. G.E. von Grunebaum (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1971), p. 75-89.

Although, with the passage of time, Makdisi suggests, the Traditionalist institutions were not immune to Rationalist infiltration, as is illustrated by the fact that the Ash‘arite movement, in search of a home, infiltrated into the Shafi‘ite school like the Mu‘tazilite did into the Hanafite,¹⁵³ the Traditionalists had succeeded in their attempt to exclude the Rationalists from their institutions.¹⁵⁴

The defeat of the Mu‘tazilites in the political arena, on the other hand, forced them to make use of *uṣūl al-fiqh* as an intellectual vehicle to maintain the rational influence with which they had introduced some of the problems of philosophical theology and legal philosophy. The character of *uṣūl al-fiqh* changed from purely traditionalist, in the sense that al-Shāfi‘ī does not treat a single problem of *kalām*, to rationalist, in the sense that it deals with philosophico-theological problems. *Uṣūl al-fiqh*, which was founded by al-Shāfi‘ī in opposition to *kalām*, acquired authors whom al-Shāfi‘ī himself had previously called ‘the Partisans of Words’, *Mutakallimūn*.¹⁵⁵ The intellectual effort of the Rationalist camp, Makdisi suggests, gained their success. This is clearly illustrated by the fact that many eminent scholars of Shafi‘ite or Hanbalite juridical denomination have dealt with the inroads made by other sciences into the field of *uṣūl al-fiqh*.¹⁵⁶

The result of such infiltration brought about the phenomenon by which a Sunni Muslim, a member of a Rationalist movement, could also become a member of a Sunni guild of law. Setting examples, Makdisi then enumerates a number of scholars knowledgeable of the ‘foreign sciences’, such as the Shafi‘ite al-Gazālī (d. 505/1111) with the Ash‘arite theological tendency with his introduction of logic into *uṣūl al-fiqh*, Sayf al-Dīn al-Amīdī (d. 631/1233), who was sacked from his chair of law of the ‘Azīziyya Madrasa for teaching philosophy and philosophical theology, and Ibn ‘Aqīl whose *al-Wādīh fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh* was receptive to a Rationalist instrument of methodology, dialectics.¹⁵⁷

Examining his *Rise*, his five articles and one book-chapter, which I can only mention briefly here,¹⁵⁸ Makdisi can be said to have discussed the opposition of a number of personalities to *kalām*: such as Abū al-Ḥasan al-Karajī (d. 532/1138), Abū Shāma al-Dimashqī al-Shāfi‘ī (d. 665/1268), Abū Sulaymān al-Ḥatṭābī al-Bustī (d. 388/999), al-Sam‘ānī (d. 562/1166), Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfarāyīnī (d. 406/1016), Abū Ishaq al-Shīrāzī (d. 476/1083)¹⁵⁹ and his Hanbalite colleague, the Sharīf Abū Ja‘far

¹⁵³Makdisi, *op. cit.*, (1990), p. 42.

¹⁵⁴Makdisi, *op. cit.*, (1990), p. 26.

¹⁵⁵Makdisi, *op. cit.*, (1990), p. 4-5.

¹⁵⁶ Makdisi, *op. cit.*, (1990), p. 4.

¹⁵⁷Makdisi, *op. cit.*, (1990), p. 42-3.

¹⁵⁸Makdisi, G., “The Non-Ash‘arite Shafi‘ism of Abū Ḥāmid Ghazzālī”, in REI (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1986) LIV, p. 239-257; “Ashari and the Asharites in Islamic Religious History” in SI (G-P. Maisonneuve –Larose Paris XVII & XVIII, 1962), p. 37-80 & 19- 39; “The Juridical Theology of Shafi‘ī Origins and Significance of *Uṣūl al-Fiqh*” in SI, LIX, 1984, p. 5-48; “Law and Traditionalism in the Institutions of Learning of Medieval Islam” in *Theology and Law in Islam*, ed. G.E. von Grunebaum (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1971), p. 75-89; “Hanbalite Islam,” in Swartz, *op. cit.*, p. 216-274.

¹⁵⁹Makdisi identifies him with the author of *Tabaqāt* who “indicated the transmission of authoritative knowledge from the Prophet himself, as the first mufti-jurisconsult, across the generations, down to his day, to drive home the idea that *ḥadīth* and law – not *kalām*

(d. 470/1077), the Hanbalite Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1200),¹⁶⁰ Ibn Taymiyya (d. 729/1329), al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348)¹⁶¹ who listed Abu 'l-Hasan al-Hammāmī (d. 417/1026), 'Abd al-Ganī Sa'īd (d. 409/1018), Abū 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulamī (d. 412/1021), Abū 'Amr b. Darraj (d. 421/1030), Ibn al-Bawwāb (d. 413/1022), the Sultan Mahmūd b. Sabuktakīn (d. 421/1030), and the Hanbalite Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 751/1350).

Besides, Makdisi exhaustively discusses the hostile attitude toward *kalām* of the “celebrated doctor of the Hanbalite theologic-juridical school”, Muwaffaq al-Dīn b. Qudāma.¹⁶² In the introduction of his translation, *Ibn Qudāma's Censure of Speculative Theology*, Makdisi says that Ibn Qudāma in this work not only specifically condemns Ibn 'Aqīl, but also censures those who indulge in speculative theology, i.e. those who apply allegorical interpretation of the revealed text with regard to the divine attributes.¹⁶³ Ibn Qudāma, Makdisi reiterates, opposes all manner of speculation in matters of religious belief because such speculation is unorthodox.¹⁶⁴

According to Ibn Qudāma, Makdisi says, speculative theology (*kalām*) was prohibited not only because of the fact that the pious ancestors did not practise it, but also for its inherent danger, i.e. that speculative theology leads to the use of allegorical interpretation (*ta'wīl*) whose principal evil is that it leads to the practice of stripping God of the attributes which He attributed to Himself and of those which He did not.¹⁶⁵

Representing the Traditionalists i.e. in defence of the Hanbalite school against the accusation of anthropomorphism, Ibn Qudāma, Makdisi argues, advocates the unreserved acceptance of the Koranic expressions and the traditions on the divine attribute as they stand and as they were handed down from the Prophet without attempting any interpretation. A rationale of Ibn Qudāma's advocating this principle is that only God knows their intended meaning. This principle is what distinguishes, according to Ibn Qudāma, the pious believers, the followers of the pious ancestors, from the error-laden partisans of allegorical interpretation, the speculative theologians.¹⁶⁶

and *falsafā* – have their origin in the teaching of the Prophet.” Makdisi, *op. cit.*, (1990), p. 6-7.

¹⁶⁰The role of Ibn al-Jawzī becomes clear from the fact that he transmitted in his *al-Muntaṣam* the promulgation of the traditionalist creed by al-Qādir, which condemned deviations from Traditionalist teaching on the authority of his teacher of *hadīth*, the Shafi'iite Abu 'l-Fadl b. al-Nāṣir (d. 550/1155), who had learned it from the Hanbalite Abu 'l-Husayn b. al-Farrā' (d. 526/1133). Makdisi, *op. cit.*, (1990), p. 8.

¹⁶¹Al-Dhahabī's list preserved in his biographical work is identified here by Makdisi as conveying the same Traditionalist message as the Creed promulgated by Al-Qādir, i.e. condemning the Rationalists. Makdisi, *op. cit.*, (1990), p. 8.

¹⁶²According to Makdisi, Ibn Qudāma does not censure theology as the knowledge of God, but rather that particular type of theology which Ibn Qudāma describes as theorizing without sufficient evidence. See *Ibn Qudāma's Censure of Speculative Theology: An Edition and Translation of Ibn Qudāma's Tahrīm al-Nāṣar fī Kutub Ahl al-Kalām* (London: Luzac & Company Ltd., 1962), p. ix.

¹⁶³Makdisi, *op. cit.*, (1962), p. lvi.

¹⁶⁴Ibidem.

¹⁶⁵Makdisi, *op. cit.*, (1962), p. lvii.

¹⁶⁶Makdisi, *op. cit.*, (1962), p. lviii.

2.2.2. Daiber (1981)

The position of Ibn Qudāma (d. 620/1223) regarding heresy and the heretics became clearer when Ibn Qudāma's Creed (*'Aqīda al-Imām al-Maqdisī*) was edited and given a succinct commentary by Daiber, who discussed very comprehensively not only the sources to which Ibn Qudāma referred but also how his Creed would become an important reference for his disciples as well as scholars of later generations, who opposed all rationalistic tendencies.¹⁶⁷ According to Hans Daiber, this text 'turns out to be a typical product of the Ḥanbalite school', and appears to depend on the writings of Ibn Ḥanbal.¹⁶⁸

According to Daiber, the sources to which Ibn Qudama referred in his Creed were the Creed of Ibn Battā al-‘Ukbarī, (d. 387/997) *al-Sharḥ wa l-Ibāna ‘an Uṣūl al-Sunna wa l-Diyānā*; and *I‘tiqād Ahl al-Sunna* of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855). Ibn Qudāma also shares his theological ideas with the Creeds ('aqā‘id) of some Ḥanbalites of the 5th/11th century, like Abū ‘Alī al-Hāshimī and al-Barbahārī.¹⁶⁹ Daiber also deals with several scholars who referred to Ibn Qudāma in their staunch criticism of the theologians with rationalistic tendencies. In his opinion, the historian al-Ṭabarī's *Sarīḥ al-Sunna* and Abū Bakr Al-Ājurrī's *Kitāb al-Shari‘a* record articles of faith which can also be found in the Creed of Ibn Qudāma and can be traced back to common Ḥanbalite sources.¹⁷⁰

Because of his unfavourable attitude toward the Ash‘arite school of his time, according to Daiber, Ibn Qudāma, when defining *īmān*, avoids to use *tasdīq*, a term commonly used by the Ash‘arites. For his staunch criticism of the scholars who made use of the rationalistic methods of the Mu‘tazilites, such as Ibn ‘Aqīl (d. 513/1119), Ibn Qudāma, Daiber argues, composed *Tahrīm al-Nazar fī Kutub Ahl al-Kalām*. Ibn Qudāma's opposition to *kalām* also inspired his disciple, Abū Shāma, to compose a work against heresy, *Kitāb al-Bā‘ith ‘alā Inkār al-Bida‘ wa l-Hawādīth*.¹⁷¹

2.2.3. Pavlin (1996)

Pavlin also draws our attention to the history of the Muslim opposition to speculative theology.¹⁷² He identifies the theologians as those who were engaged in disputes on theological controversies, such as the nature of God and His attributes. Their theological disputes are closely connected to their attempt to interpret allegorically certain obscure verses concerning the Attributes of God. In this light, speculative theology, Pavlin suggests, had already become subjected to the attack by its opponents as early as the Companions of the Prophet who

¹⁶⁷Daiber, Hans, "The Creed ('Aqīda) of the Ḥanbalite Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī A Newly Discovered Text," *Studia Arabica and Islamica, Festschrift for Ihsān Abbās on his Sixtieth Birthday*, Wadād al-Qādī (ed.), (Beirut: American University of Beirut, 1981), p. 105-125.

¹⁶⁸Daiber, *op. cit.*, (1981), p. 107.

¹⁶⁹Daiber, *op. cit.*, (1981), p. 106-7.

¹⁷⁰Daiber, *op. cit.*, (1981), p. 107.

¹⁷¹Daiber, *op. cit.*, (1981), p. 107-8.

¹⁷²Pavlin, J., "Sunni Kalām and Theological Controversies," in *History of Islamic Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 1996), ed. Seyyed Hossein Nasr and Oliver Leaman, vol. I, p. 105-118.

maintained a belief in the clarity of the Koranic verses, shunning allegorical interpretation. Following this principle, individuals such as Mālik b. Anas (d. 179/795), Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 245/855), al-Buḥārī (d. 256/870), and Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī (d. 620/1223) are listed by Pavlin as those who had an intense hatred of speculative theology.¹⁷³

2.2.4. Abrahamov (1998)

The opposition to theology and the theologians is extensively and systematically dealt with by Abrahamov in his study which focuses on the trend and direction of the dispute between the “Rationalists” i.e., the heralds of speculative reasoning and logical reasoning in matters of faith, and the Traditionalist i.e., the heralds of the tradition.¹⁷⁴ Abrahamov presents several identifications of the Traditionalists, viz. (1) those who avoided the dispute between philosophy and tradition, whereas they put forward arguments in the dispute between speculative theology and tradition; (2) those who usually do not practice theological speculation in their works or those who minimize the use of speculative arguments; (3) those who maintain that the first foundation of traditionalism is strict adherence to the teachings of the Koran, the Sunna and the consensus mainly of the first generations of scholars; (4) when disputing with the “Rationalists”, the Traditionalists, such as Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, sometimes combine traditional and rational proof in their arguments; (5) the Traditionalists sometimes make use of the technical terms of their adversaries to prove that the latter contradict their own arguments. Abrahamov argues convincingly that Traditionalism is not a monopoly of the Hanbalite scholars, but can also be found among the adherents of the Shafi‘ite, the Malikite and the Hanafite schools. Those who employ reason in their arguments, like Ibn Taymiyya, are referred to by Abrahamov as the *Mutakallimū Ahl al-Hadīth* (the speculative theologians of the people of Tradition).¹⁷⁵

According to Abrahamov, the issue against which the Traditionalists launched their criticism is the use of rational arguments by the “Rationalists” as reflected in their use of independent rational interpretation (*tafsīr bi ’l-ra’y*), and the use of analogical reasoning (*qiyās*) in deducing law from the Koran and the Sunna. Their hostile attitude toward the rationalists, Abrahamov argues, is reflected in two forms: (1) Their prohibition of engaging in theological dispute, including breaking off relations with the *mutakallimūn*, (2) the refutation of the “Rationalists” tenets.¹⁷⁶

2.2.5. Juynboll (1998)

Objections¹⁷⁷ against theology can also be found in Juynboll’s *Sunna*,¹⁷⁸ his *Excursus*,¹⁷⁹ and his review of Van Ess’ *Theologie und Gesellschaft*.¹⁸⁰ Although

¹⁷³Ibidem.

¹⁷⁴Abrahamov, B., *Islamic Theology: Traditionalism and Rationalism* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998), p. 8.

¹⁷⁵Abrahamov, *op. cit.*, p. 1-11.

¹⁷⁶Ibidem.

¹⁷⁷Here, I was confronted with G.H.A. Juynboll’s personal suggestion that he prefers to use the term ‘objection’ rather than the term ‘opposition.’ I am indebted to him, who, at

the whole passage is mainly concerned with a discussion of the development of the term *sunna* from the *Jāhiliyya* until the third century of Islam, Juynboll's discussion of the objection to theology can be found in his description of certain historical personalities, figuring in his writing, when discussing the appellative *Sunna, Ahl al-Sunna* as well as *Sāhib (Aṣḥāb) al-Sunna*. The motive of their opposition to *ahl al-bida'* is illustrated by their arguments against their opponents among whom are theologians (*Mutakallimūn*).¹⁸¹

2.2.7. Al-Hashshash (2000)

Finally, the discussion of more than two centuries of opposition to theology by Muslim scholars ranging from Ahmad b. Hanbal (d. 245/855) till al-Harawī (d. 481/1089) was dealt with by al-Hashshash in his discussion of “*Die Hanbaliten in der Zeit zwischen der Mīhna Ibn Hanbals und der Mīhna des al-Anṣārī*”¹⁸² Based on his study of *Dhamm al-Kalām* by al-Harawī (d. 481/1089), al-Hashshash underlines the Hanbalites' struggle against theology. According to al-Hashshash, Ahmad b. Hanbal constitutes a key figure in the opposition to the theologians. His fervent attitude against theology caused him and his followers, during more than two centuries and in various regions of the Islamic world, to be repressed by the ruling authorities. Such repression was not only felt by Ahmad b. Hanbal and his contemporary followers, upon whom al-Ma'mūn (198-218/813-833) had afflicted the *mīhna* (the “Inquisition”), but also by the Hanbalites of later generations, including al-Harawī himself.

3. Al-Suyūtī’s Position

3.1. Al-Suyūtī’s View on the Origin of Islamic Theology

As far as the position of al-Suyūtī is concerned, it can be said here that his view is strikingly parallel with the view of certain modern scholars who asserted that the development of *kalām* is not only due to an external factor, i.e. the translation movement of Greek writings, but also to an internal one, i.e. the need of an art of debate for religious argumentation.

In his SM, al-Suyūtī discusses a number of topics regarding the origin and the foundation of logic, its introduction into the religious community of Islam,

times, has guided me through the jungle of the orientalists' collection in the ‘magna’ University Library of the Leiden University.

¹⁷⁸ EI², vol.IX, p. 878-81.

¹⁷⁹ “An Excursus on the the *Ahl al-Sunna* in Connection with Van Ess, *Theologie und Gesselschaft*, vol. IV” in *Der Islam* Band 75 Heft 2 (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998), p. 318-329.

¹⁸⁰ Juynboll, G.H.A., “Josef van Ess’ *Theologie und Gessellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra. Eine Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im frühen Islam*. Berlin/New York 1991, 1992 (Walter de Gruyter) Band I, II, III in *Der Islam* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), Band 71, p. 363-371.

¹⁸¹ Juynboll, *op. cit.*, (1997), p. 880; idem, *op. cit.*, (1998), p. 320-1.

¹⁸² Al-Hashshash, Mohammad, *Zwischen Tradition und Aufbruch, Die Ablehnung und Verleumündung der spekulativen Theologie – Dhamm al-Kalām wa Ahlih - in der Frühzeit des Islam: Ursachen und Folgen* (Inaugural Dissertation at Rheinischen-Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität at Bonn: 2000), p. 237-302.

and scholars who connected the works on *uṣūl al-fiqh* and *uṣūl al-dīn* to logic, as well as its diffusion among later scholars.¹⁸³ Al-Suyūṭī gives weight to the importation of the books of Greekdom and the translation movement through the mediation of al-Ma'mūn's explicit policy in favour of foreign sciences. In dealing with the origin of logic and that of Islamic theology *vis a vis* Greek influence, al-Suyūṭī can be said to have distinguished two different orientations between logic and theology. Logic was first made use of by Muslims after their cultural and intellectual contact with Hellenism. Logical speculation, according to al-Suyūṭī, was closely associated with the translation movement, as mentioned briefly above, whereas the origin of *kalām* arose out of the need for an art of debate on religious issues which had been practiced since the time of the Prophet and the Companions.

However, in dealing with *kalām*, al-Suyūṭī's view can be said to come close to that of Van Ess and Daiber, mentioned earlier. Al-Suyūṭī provides a lot of data concerning disputes of early Muslims on matters pertaining to the Islamic creed. These disputes had been practiced by the Muslims long before the importation of Greek books and the translation movement. Referring to al-Harawī, al-Buhārī, al-Lālakā'ī, al-Ājurri and al-Sam'ānī, al-Suyūṭī holds the view that the opposition to *kalām*, *jadal*, *naẓar* and *marā'* had already started with the Prophet, who said that "the perishing of those before us happened because of their frequent questions (posed to) and their arguments with their prophets," and who prayed: "O God, I ask your protection against knowledge which has no significance..." According to al-Suyūṭī, the opposition to *kalām* was also performed by the Companions. 'Umar b. al-Haṭṭāb, for instance, lashed Ṣabīg because of a question posed by him concerning a variant reading of the Koran till the blood ran from his back. Likewise, 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib warned people that at the end of time there would be a people whose speech and arguments were not known by the adherents of Islam. They would be inviting the people to adhere to their message. If one meets them, one is to kill them. When he was encountered with a question of *kalām*, 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib even prepared himself for fighting.

However, al-Suyūṭī argues that logic and *kalām* have intricate relations, which implies that logic, to a certain extent, can be identified with *kalām* and *vice-versa*. The intricate relation between them is clearly indicated, for instance, when he speaks of the (legal) reasons (*'ilal*) why they were both prohibited. According to al-Suyūṭī, these reasons are: *First*, the Pious Ancestors were not concerned with them; *secondly*, they lead to dissension and error.

Al-Suyūṭī seems to have seen that speculative and rational argumentation (*nazar*, *marā'*, *jidāl*, *kalām*, etc), which had already been practiced since the time of the Prophet, were provided with a sophisticated method borrowed from Greek culture, when the Muslims encountered the Sciences of the Ancients. This is clearly reflected in his remarks: "...that the Sciences of the Ancients had reached the Muslims in the first century when they had conquered the lands of the non-Arabs. But they had not spread among them widely and had not become generally known among them since the ancestors had prohibited [us] from being engrossed in them. However, [the Greek sciences] became popular in al-Barmaki's period, while their spread increased in the period of al-Ma'mūn because of the

¹⁸³For an elaborate discussion of this issue see Chapter 3, p. 88-90.

innovations he stimulated and the occupation with the sciences of the Ancients as well as the extinguishing of the Sunna he promoted.”¹⁸⁴

The fate that befell this ‘indigenous’ art of debate through this cultural encounter is clearly indicated by al-Suyūṭī, who includes *‘ilm al-kalām* as one of the sciences of the ancients, “whose origin was found among the materialist philosophers.”¹⁸⁵ Saying this, al-Suyūṭī seems to give the impression that the rudimentary practice of *takallama* needed to be refined through the adoption of a foreign sophisticated science, viz. the *‘ilm al-kalām* (discursive theology). He purposely used the term *‘ilm al-kalām*, which implies such a development, was referred to by Gardet and Anawati as that of ‘la période de fermentation.’

3.2. Al-Suyūṭī’s Contributions to the Study of the Islamic Opposition to Logic and Theology

Our understanding of the Muslim opposition to logic and theology may be furthered by the study of the four works on these subjects written by Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī. These works are, in the historical order of their composition:

3.2.1. *Al-Qawl al-Mushriq fī Tahrīm al-Ishtigāl bi ‘Ilm al-Manṭiq*

Of the four works against logic by al-Suyūṭī, QM can be said to have been composed first, i.e. in 867 or 868/1465 or 1466. This is clearly indicated in the introduction of SM, which states: “Long ago, in the year 867 or 868 [H] I composed a book on the prohibition of being occupied with the art of logic, which I named “*al-Qawl al-Mushriq*” into which I included the statements of the learned men of Islam to condemn and prohibit it.”¹⁸⁶

In this work al-Suyūṭī discusses either explicitly or incidentally the opposition of more than 40 leading scholars of various law schools to logic by referring to more than 28 works which deal either explicitly or incidentally with the same issue.

Despite the fact that Brockelmann has given adequate reference to it in his celebrated *Geschichte*,¹⁸⁷ it may be said here that not a single reference to QM has been made by modern scholars. This is presumably due to the fact that QM has not been published yet in a printed edition.

3.2.2. *Jahd al-Qariha fī Tajrīd al-Naṣīḥa*

As can be clearly read in the introduction of SM, al-Suyūṭī abridged Ibn Taymiyya’s *Naṣīḥat Ahl al-Īmān fī ʻl-Radd ‘alā Manṭiq al-Yūnān* in 888, after QM and before SM. The scope of this work comprises al-Suyūṭī’s discussion of IT’s attempt to unravel the main theses on which the logicians founded their logic: (1) *Al-taṣawwur lā yunālu illā bi ʼl-hadd* (no concept can be formed except by means of definition); (2) *Al-hadd mufid taṣawwur al-ashyā'* (definition leads to the conception of things), (3) *Al-taṣdiq lā yunālu illā bi ʼl-qiyās* (judgement cannot be

¹⁸⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 445.

¹⁸⁵“wa lihādhā dhamma ‘ulamā’ al-salaf al-naẓar fī ‘ilm al-awā’il: fa-inna ‘ilm al-kalām mawlūd min ‘ilm al-ḥukamā’ al-dahriyya...” SM, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

¹⁸⁶See al-Suyūṭī’s introduction of SM, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

¹⁸⁷GAL, II, 189.

formed except by means of analogy), and (4) *Al-burhān yufid al-‘ilm bi ‘l-taṣdīqāt* (demonstration leads to certain knowledge of judgements).¹⁸⁸

First of all, it should be noted that this work has been translated and introduced by Hallaq, in his *Ibn Taymiyya against the Greek Logicians*. This work has also been referred to by modern scholars for more than one purpose. Al-Nashshār in his *Manāhij*, for instance, exhaustively refers to JQ when dealing with Ibn Taymiyya's discussion against logic,¹⁸⁹ and with the attitude of the jurists (*fuqahā’*) toward logic.¹⁹⁰ Likewise, al-Jābirī relies on JQ when discussing the attitude of the Ithna ‘Ashariyya Shi‘ites toward Greek philosophy and logic.¹⁹¹ Al-Zayn and Abū Zahra also make use of it when dealing with Ibn Taymiyya's logic and intellectual method¹⁹² and with the biography of Ibn Taymiyya.¹⁹³

3.2.3.. *Sawn al-Manṭiq wa ‘l-Kalām ‘an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa ‘l-Kalām*

SM was the third work which al-Suyūtī composed in order to deal with the opposition to logic and theology. Like JQ, this work was composed in 888 when some of al-Suyūtī's contemporaries rejected his claim for *ijtihād*, since he allegedly lacked the knowledge of logic which was claimed to be one of its prerequisites. This work revolves around the history and origin of logic, its introduction into the Muslim world, the reaction of leading Muslim scholars against it, its connection to theology and the reaction of Muslim scholars against theology and the refutation against one who introduced logic into grammar.

Like JQ, SM has also been referred to by modern scholars, for more than one purpose. Regarding SM as the most complete encyclopaedia dealing with the criticism of Greek logic,¹⁹⁴ al-Nashshār in his *Manāhij* relied on it when dealing with (1) the history of the introduction of Aristotelian logic to the Muslim world,¹⁹⁵ (2) the attitude of the Uṣulists, i.e. the scholars of *uṣūl al-fiqh*, and the theologians (*mutakallimūn*) toward Aristotelian logic,¹⁹⁶ and (3) the attitude of the jurists (*fuqahā’*) toward logic.¹⁹⁷ Likewise, SM has been frequently referred to by al-Jābirī in his discussion of the attitude of the Ithna ‘Ashariyya Shi‘ites

¹⁸⁸In the translation of these logical principles, I rely fully on Hallaq's translation of JQ in his, *Ibn Taymiyya Against the Greek Logicians*, translation with an introduction and notes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), p. 3-174.

¹⁸⁹Al-Nashshār, *op. cit.*, p.83, 91, 139, 150-8, 165, 168-179 .

¹⁹⁰Al-Nashshār, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

¹⁹¹Al-Jābirī's reference to SM can be found in his work, *op. cit.*, in p. 52, 58, 84, 90, 93, 96, 119, 121, 123; to JQ in p. 101, 123, 131-2, 140, 142.

¹⁹²Al-Zayn refers to SM when dealing with the Muslim attitude toward logic in p. 32, 36-7 and to JQ when representing IT's logic in p. 38, 44, 48-53, 55, 70, 87, 86-9, 91-2, 103, 149, 164-5See al-Zayn, Muḥammad Ḥusnī, *Manṭiq Ibn Taymiyya wa Manhajuh al-Fikrī* (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1979).

¹⁹³Abū Zahra refers to JQ in his discussion of the intellectual biography of Ibn Taymiyya in his *Ibn Taymiyya: Hayātuh wa ‘Aṣruh; Arā’uh wa Fiqhuh* (Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-‘Arabī, 1953), p. 250.

¹⁹⁴“wa hādhā ‘l-kitāb yu’tabar awsa‘ mawsū‘at fīmā na‘lam fī mawdū‘ naqd al-manṭiq al-yūnāni.” See al-Nashshār, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

¹⁹⁵Al-Nashshār, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

¹⁹⁶Al-Nashshār, *op. cit.*, p. 69, 70, .

¹⁹⁷Al-Nashshār, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

toward Greek philosophy and logic,¹⁹⁸ and by Abrahamov especially when discussing the attitude of the partisans of Tradition toward the partisans of Reason,¹⁹⁹ as well as by Fodah in his critical survey of the early Muslim opponents of logic.²⁰⁰ The first five printed-pages of SM in which al-Suyūṭī discusses his motive for composing SM have also incidentally been referred to by Sartain in her study of al-Suyūṭī's biography,²⁰¹ by Van Ess,²⁰² by Hallaq in the introduction to his annotated translation of Ibn Taymiyya's *Nasīḥa*,²⁰³ and by Geoffroy, when dealing with al-Suyūṭī's condemnation of Hellenistic logic.²⁰⁴ Along the same line, SM was also consulted by Madkour when discussing Aristotle's logic among the *Mutakallimūn* and its influence on the Arab world,²⁰⁵ and by al-Rouayheb when dealing with the Sunnī Muslim Scholars' attitude towards Logic.²⁰⁶

3.2.4. Al-Suyūṭī's *Fatwā*

The *fatwā* was the fourth work composed to prohibit logic. That this work was composed after JQ and SM is clearly indicated in a passage which says that he abridged IT's *Nasīḥa*, i.e. JQ, and composed a volume to condemn logic, i.e. SM. Like any other *fatwā*, this *fatwā* starts with a question on the issue of logic, and is then followed by al-Suyūṭī's prohibition in reference to 43 scholars whom he claims to have prohibited logic.

As far as the fact whether this work has been referred to by modern scholars is concerned, it should be said that only Brunschwig relies on it when he discusses the attitude of Ibn Ḥazm, al-Gazālī and Ibn Taymiyya toward Greek logic.²⁰⁷

4. The Scope of the Present work

¹⁹⁸ Al-Jābirī's reference to SM can be found in his work, *op. cit.*, in p. 52, 58, 84, 90, 93, 96, 119, 121, 123; to JQ in p. 101, 123, 131-2, 140, 142.

¹⁹⁹ Abrahamov's extensive reference to SM can be found in his *Islamic Theology*, *op. cit.*, p. 23, 65, 69, 73-4, 77, 80-1, 83, 84-5, 91.

²⁰⁰ Fodah even devotes one chapter to an examination of al-Suyūṭī's attitude toward logic and *kalām* and an analysis of several sources on which al-Suyūṭī relies in his discussion in SM. See Fodah, Saeed, *Tadīm al-Manṭiq: Jawla Naqdiyya ma'a ʔ-Mu'āridīn li 'Ilm al-Manṭiq mina ʔ-Mutaqaddimīn* (Amman: Dār al-Rāzī, 2002), esp. p. 114-181.

²⁰¹ Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 69 ; see also her note, no. 144.

²⁰² Van Ess, J., "Logical Structure of Islamic Theology," in G.E. von Grunebaum (ed.) *Theology and Law in Islam* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1971), p. 50; See also his note no. 150.

²⁰³ Hallaq, *op. cit.*, p. xl ix; see also his note no. 180.

²⁰⁴ Geoffroy, E., "al-Suyūṭī," EI², IX, 915.

²⁰⁵ "Il y en a qui sous-estiment aujourd'hui le rôle joué par la logique d'Aristote dans le monde arabe ou qui le nient complètement. C'est sans doute sous l'influence d'un certain traité d'al-Suyūṭī publié dernièrement et auguel nous avons fait mention auparavant..." Madkour , I., "La Logique d'Aristote chez les Motakallimīn," in Parviz Morewedge (ed.) *Islamic Philosophical Theology* (Albany : State University of New York Press, 1979), p.59, 63-4, 66-7.

²⁰⁶ Al-Rouayheb, *op. cit.* p. 213-32.

²⁰⁷ Brunschwig, Robert, "Los teólogos juristas del Islam en pro o en contra de la lógica griega: Ibn Hazm, al-Gazali, Ibn Taymiyya," in *Al-Andalus*, 35: 1 (1970), p. 176.

The purpose of the present work is to deal with the following research-question:

What can we learn from al-Suyūṭī's four works against logic and theology about the history of Islamic thought concerning the condemnation of logic and theology, in addition to the light shed on this subject by modern scholars quoted earlier?

In dealing with this research-question, I will discuss in the first chapter al-Suyūṭī's earliest contribution to the history of the opposition to logic, entitled *al-Qawl al-Mushriq fī Tahrīm al-Ishtigāl bi 'Ilm al-Manṭiq*, written by him when he was still a student of 18 years old. I will deal with the manuscripts and the edition of QM (1.1), the date and purpose of its composition (1.2), as well as with an analysis of its contents (1.3). In my conclusion, I shall evaluate this work as a source for the history of Muslim opposition to logic (1.4).

In chapter two, I will discuss al-Suyūṭī's abridgement of IT's *Nasīḥa*, entitled, *Jahd al-Qarīha fī Tajrīd al-Nasīḥa*, a work composed when his knowledge of logic was doubted by some of his contemporaries. I will deal with the date (2.1) and purpose of his abridgement (2.2). I will also assess the contribution made by al-Suyūṭī in rendering IT's *Nasīḥa* more comprehensible. Elements of IT's religious viewpoints against logic and theology in JQ will also be discussed (2.3). Some pages are devoted to deal with the question how al-Suyūṭī selected IT's viewpoints against logic in his JQ (2.4). In the conclusion, I shall analyse the rationale of al-Suyūṭī's selection of IT's arguments in it (2.5).

Chapter three will discuss al-Suyūṭī's work that was composed twenty years after QM, when his call for *ijtihād* was refused by some of his contemporaries who doubted his ability to comply with an alleged precondition for *ijtihād*, i.e., the knowledge of logic. I will deal, first of all, with the manuscript and the edition of SM (3.1), with the date (3.2) and the purpose of the composition of this work, i.e. *Sawn al-Manṭiq* (3.3). An analysis will also be given of the content of this work (3.4). In my conclusion, I shall again evaluate this work as a source for the history of Muslim opposition to logic and theology (3.5).

In chapter four, I will discuss al-Suyūṭī's *Fatwā* against logic. In so doing, first of all, I will deal with its manuscript (4.1). I will give an analysis of the content of this *fatwā* (4.2) and evaluate this sources on which al-Suyūṭī relies when issuing this *fatwā* (4.3).

In the conclusion, I will try to answer the research-question formulated above by synthesizing the last paragraphs of each of the four chapters of this study.

Chapter One

al-Qawl al-Mushriq fī Tahrīm al-Ishtigāl bi ‘Ilm al-Manṭiq: Its Manuscripts, the Date and Purpose of its Composition as well as its Content and Sources

This chapter will deal with the manuscripts and the edition of QM (1.1), the date and purpose of its composition (1.2), as well as with an analysis of its contents (1.3). In the conclusion, I shall evaluate this work as a source for the history of Muslim opposition to logic (1.4).

1. 1. The manuscripts

Only two manuscripts of QM are known: the first was kept at Hizānat al-Kutub al-Āṣafiyya in Haydarabad (the Ms is now preserved at Andhra Pradesh Government Oriental Manuscripts Library and Research Institute),²⁰⁸ and the second is a transcript made by a Moroccan librarian, the late Muṣṭafā Nājī, from a manuscript of QM in a private collection, which was heavily damaged. This transcript is at Van Koningsveld's disposal. The transcript consists of 18 pages (of A4 paper). Each page which comprises 30 lines is replete with lacunas. Obviously, the original from which the copy was made, was in a very deplorable state of preservation. The script, however, is clear, with diacritical signs for ambiguous words. Alternative readings are also provided at occasional doubtful passages.

1. 2. The Date and Purpose of the Composition of QM

In his *Kitāb Bahjat al-Ābidīn bi Tarjamat Ḥāfiẓ al-‘Aṣr Jalāl al-Dīn*,²⁰⁹ al-Shādhilī²¹⁰ quoted al-Suyūṭī as having said: "...Generally speaking, I think little of logic. Then I came across the statements by leading scholars censuring it and a *fatiwā* of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ against it. In sum, I became averse to it completely. Therefore, I wrote a quire [of a work] which I entitled *al-Gayth al-Mugriq fī Tahrīm al-Manṭiq*."²¹¹ From this statement, one might hastily conclude that al-

²⁰⁸GAL, S. II, 189. After having been informed by a staff of the Oriental Collection at the Leiden University Library that the microfilm of the catalogue of Hizānat al-Kutub al-Āṣafiyya, *Fihrist-i Arabi, Farsi wa Urdu Maḥzūna Kutub Kana-i Asafiyya-i Sarkar-i Ali Kutub Kana-i Asafiyya-i Sarkar-i Ali* (Haydarabad, 1332-1347/1914-1928) 3 vols, was lost, I had to confirm myself here to the other Ms; According to Khalidi, in 1975 all the Ms of the Āṣafiyya were transferred to the Andhra Pradesh Government Oriental Manuscripts Library and Research Institute, in Osmania University Campus. See Khalidi, Omar, "A Guide to Arabic, Persian, Turkish, and Urdu Manuscript Libraries in India," in MELA Notes 75-76 (Fall 2002-Spring 2003), esp. 8-9.

²⁰⁹MS, Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, 4436, 10, 4574 (2). I would like to express my gratitude to Carla Williams of Chester Beatty Library who provided me with this manuscript.

²¹⁰Abd al-Qādir b. Muḥammad al-Shādhilī was one of al-Suyūṭī's biographers and closest disciples, who was given by the latter the *ḥirqa*. See Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 34, 49.

²¹¹"...fa ‘zdāratu al-mantiq jumlatan thumma waqāftu ‘alā kalām al-‘ulāma’ fī dhammihī wa mā aftā bihī ibn al-ṣalāḥ familtu ‘an al-mantiq kulla ‘I-mayl fa allaftu kurrāsatān al-

Suyūṭī had composed another work in his early age besides QM. However, it should be noted here that *al-Gayth al-Mugriq* is identical to QM, based on obvious reasons. First, al-Suyūṭī has neither listed a writing by him with the title *al-Gayth al-Mugriq* in his autobiographical work, *al-Taḥadduth*,²¹² nor in his earlier historical work, *Husn al-Muḥāḍara*,²¹³ where he also provided a list of his own writings, nor has he referred to it in other works dealing with the same issue. In the introduction to SM, al-Suyūṭī (born in 849/1448) indicated however: “Long ago, in the year 867 or 868 [H] I composed a book on the prohibition of being occupied with the art of logic, which I named “*al-Qawl al-Mushriq*” in which I included the statements of the learned men of Islam to condemn and prohibit it.”²¹⁴ Although without any indication concerning its title, a work against logic al-Suyūṭī composed when he was eighteen years is mentioned in a statement of his, quoted by al-Shādhilī, which reads: “... If one fabricates lies to you [about me], know that since I grew up I have been destined to love the Sunna and Tradition, to abhor the sciences of the ancients i.e., philosophy and logic. I composed [a work] to condemn logic when I was eighteen years old...”²¹⁵ Based on al-Suyūṭī’s clear indication in SM, as described above, it is obvious that a work composed by him when he was eighteen refers to QM, because he was born in 849/1448. *Al-Gayth al-Mugriq* might simply be either an alternative title of the work or a copying mistake by al-Shādhilī, who was one of al-Suyūṭī’s disciples and a copyist of the latter’s works.

Al-Suyūṭī’s objective in composing QM is clearly indicated by his words, which say: “Therefore I composed a work in which I collected the statements of the Pious Ancestors asserting [my] conviction that [logic was prohibited].”²¹⁶

1. 3. The Content

Although al-Suyūṭī neither divides his QM into chapters and sub-chapters nor gives any titles, based on his usage of certain expressions, like *wa ba’du* in the introductory passage which is then followed by *fa-allāftu*, and *fa-aqūlu* which is followed by *fa-qāla al-Nawawī*, *wa qāla Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*, *wa hakā*, etc, the structure of his arguments in QM can be drawn as follows:

- | | |
|--|------------|
| (A.) Introduction | (p. 1) |
| (B.) Al-Suyūṭī’s Discussion of his Predecessors’ Attitude toward Logic | (p. 1-12) |
| (C.) Legal cases which can be relied on for the prohibition of logic | (p. 13-18) |
| (D.) Reasons why logic was prohibited | (p. 18) |

gayth al-mugriq fī tahrīm al-manṭiq...” MS, Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, fol. 11b; cf, an appendix in *al-Taḥadduth*, *op. cit.* 241.

²¹² Al-Suyūṭī lists all his works in his autobiographical work, *al-Taḥadduth*, *op. cit.* p. 105-136, in which he refers to QM at p. 114.

²¹³ Al-Suyūṭī in his *Husn al-Muḥāḍara fī Aḥbār Miṣr wa Ḥarākati al-Qāhirah* (Cairo: Matba‘at al-Mawsū‘āt, 1903) only refers to QM, which is grouped as one of the works dealing with the Jurisprudence (p. 159).

²¹⁴ See al-Suyūṭī’s introduction of SM, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

²¹⁵ “*qāla rāhīmaḥu allāh idhā taqawwalah laka fā “lām annī mundhu sinnin nasha’tu alqaytu biḥubbi ḥaḍīth wa bugdī ḥaḍīth wa ‘ulūm al-awā’il min falsafah wa manṭiq wa allāftu fī dhimm al-manṭiq wa anā ibn thamān ‘ashrata sanatan...”* MS, Chester Beatty Library, *op. cit.*, fol. 34b.

²¹⁶ QM, p. 1, l. 19.

In arranging his QM, al-Suyūṭī apparently did not follow any particular method of division. He simply seems to have listed a great number of predecessors and discusses their statements against logic. This is presumably closely connected to, first of all, his speed of writing and composition, as reported by his biographer and pupil, al-Dāwūdī: “I have seen the *shayh* write three quires in one day, both composing and writing down, as well as dictate *hadīth* and answer opponents.”²¹⁷ In turn, when describing people or events, he just collected “any relevant anecdotes or oral reports,” and wrote them down “without any attempt to connect them into a coherent chronological narrative to show cause and effect.”²¹⁸

(A) Introduction and Reason for Composing the Book

The background against which al-Suyūṭī composed QM can be understood from his introduction, which the present author paraphrases as follows: When the falsity was widespread, the age regressed. The partisans of innovation were on intimate terms with the partisans of the Sunna and the Koran. Then they conjured up their being occupied with logic and with other philosophical sciences before the eyes of the latter. They also declared to them that with the help of logic, different kinds of knowledge could be obtained; any goal and purpose could be achieved. Unfortunately, no one who was occupied with it was distinguished in the science of the Sharia and able to comprehend the primary and secondary aims of the religious sciences. Moreover, their *Shayhs*, who spent their whole lives studying logic were not able to respond even to unimportant questions posed to them, for instance, concerning the *istinjā*.²¹⁹

Responding to this state of affairs, al-Suyūṭī exclaims: “Praise the Lord! This does not show that putting the obligatories in higher priorities than this science would be correct. I consider it a matter of religious sincerity to make it known that it is prohibited to occupy oneself with it. Moreover, the leading scholars of Islam have explicitly prohibited it. No one has allowed it except *al-Imām al-Gazālī* as found in a statement by him, from which, however, he withdrew as several leading scholars have also reported.”²²⁰

²¹⁷Saleh, Marlis J., “al-Suyūṭī and His Works: Their Place in Islamic Scholarship from Mamluk Times to the Present,” in *Mamlük Studies Review*, 5 (2001), 73-89, esp. 75.

²¹⁸Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 137-8 ; Brustad, Kristen, “Imposing Order : Reading Conventions of Representation in al-Suyūṭī’s Autobiography,” in *Edebiyāt* vol. VII, 2 (1997), 326-44, esp.334.

²¹⁹“fālammā kathura al-dahīl wa taqahqara al-zamān wa ‘htalaṭa ahl al-bida’ bi ahl al-sunna wa ‘l-qur’ān gādahum mā ra’aw min iqāmati kalimatihim wa ‘rtifā’i dhuruwwatihim fazayyanū lahum al-iṣṭigāl bi ‘l-maṇṭiq wa gayrihī min al-‘ulūm al-falsafīyya wa qāṣadū bihī...[a]nwā’ al-ḍarari lahum wa law lam yakun...al-i‘rād ‘alayhī min al-‘ulamā’... wa awṣū iyyāhūm anna bihādhā ‘l-ilm tudraku ‘l-ma‘ārif... al-maqāsid wa ‘l-muhiimmāt, wa...mā rāmūhū, wa tamma lahum mā abramūh fa aqbala ‘alayh shibāb al-mushtagilīn tattran tattran wa ṣurrifa kullun minhum fī tāḥṣīlīhī...wa lam yara ahadun mimmanī ‘shtagala bihī nabagun fī ‘ilmīn shar‘iyyīn wa lā ḥaṣala ‘alā maqṣūdīn aṣliyyīn aw far‘iyyīn walaqad ra’aytu ba‘da shuyūḥihim mimman afnā ‘umurahū fī hādhā ‘l-fann wa waṣala ilā nihāyat al-sinn qad su‘ila ‘an mas‘alatin sahlatin fī ‘l-istinjā wa lam yadri jawāban.”QM, p. 1. l. 9-15.

²²⁰“faqultu yā subhāna ‘llāh hallā arā hādhā ‘l-fann mā kāna taqdīm al-farā’id [‘alayhī] ṣawāban, fāra’aytu mina ‘l-nuṣḥ li ‘l-dīn al-i‘lām bi ‘anna ‘l-iṣṭigāl bihī ḥarām wa annahū

The reason for composing this work becomes clear from his statement which reads: “Therefore I composed a work in which I collected the statements of the Pious Ancestors on that matter.”²²¹

(B.) Al-Suyūtī’s Discussion of his Predecessors’ Attitude toward Logic

Before delving into the discussion of QM, two things should be noted. First of all that al-Suyūtī (b. 849/1445) was eighteen years old when he composed QM in 867/1463,²²² but had already been given *ijāzah* by al-Bulqīnī, one of his teachers, by which he was allowed to teach *fīqh* and to pronounce legal opinions according to the Shafi‘ite school of law.²²³ Yet he continued to attend the lessons of al-Shumunnī on *hadīth*, Arabic language and rhetoric.²²⁴ In composing QM, al-Suyūtī merely listed himself among the scholars who opposed logic, for which what he did first and foremost in this intellectual exercise was to marshal each statement against logic by his predecessors.

As can be read in the following discussion, al-Suyūtī contends that the prohibition of logic had a strong basis not only in the Shafi‘ite circle but also in the Malikite, Hanbalite and Hanafite as well. To prove this point, he refers to authors very well-known in their respective circles as those who prohibited logic. However, al-Suyūtī also amazingly refers to al-Gazālī, the unparalleled authority and renewer of Islamic Sciences of the sixth/eleventh century whose favourable attitude towards logic was almost undisputed,²²⁵ as one who prohibited logic.

Referring to *al-Muṣṭafā*,²²⁶ al-Suyūtī quotes al-Gazālī as having said: “*hādhīhī muqaddimat al-‘ulūm kullihā wa-man lā yuhītu bihā fa-lā thiqata lahū bi ‘ulūmihī aslan.*”²²⁷ (“[Logic] is the introduction to all sciences. One who is not well-versed in it, his authority in the sciences is not reliable at all.”)²²⁸ Basing himself on *Naṣīhat al-Muslim al-Muṣḥfiq li man Ubtuliya bi Hubb ‘Ilm al-Mantiq*

sarrāha bi tahrīmihī a’immatu Ḥ-islām wa lam yubiḥhu aḥadun illa ḥ-imām al-Gazālī fī qawlin qad raja’ a’anhū kamā naqalahū ba’d ḥ-a’imma al-a’lām. QM, p. 1, l. 15-18.

²²¹ “fa-allāstu fī hādhā ḥ-kitāb jāmī an līmā warada ‘an al-salaf fī dhālikā...” QM, p. 1, l. 19.

²²² See Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 32-3.

²²³ See Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 28, 32-3.

²²⁴ That al-Suyūtī had been a student of al-Shumunnī from 868/1463 till 872/1468, is confirmed by Sartain. See Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

²²⁵ *Al-Tahadduth*, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

²²⁶ *Al-Muṣṭafā min ‘Ilm al-Uṣūl* (Cairo: Al-Maṭba‘a al-Amīriyya, 1322/1904).

²²⁷ Responding to this statement, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, according to al-Suyūtī, said: I heard *al-Shayh* ‘Imād al-Dīn b. Yūnus reporting on the authority of *al-Shayh* Abī al-Mahāsin Yūsuf b. Bundār al-Dimashqī, a celebrated Shafi‘ite lecturer at the Nīzāmiyya College Bagdad, that the latter refuted this statement saying: ‘They were salaf who glorified their affluence (*ḥuzūzuhum*), but were not well-versed in this introduction (*muqaddima*, viz. Logic).’ QM, p. 1 (l. 28) – 2 (l. 1).

²²⁸ The full statement of al-Gazālī is as follows: “*nadhkuru fī hādhīh al-muqaddima madārik al-‘uqūl wa iḥbiṣārahā fī ḥ-hadd wa ḥ-burhān, wa nadhkuru sharṭ al-ḥadd al-ḥaqiqī wa sharṭ al-burhān al-ḥaqiqī wa aqsāmahā ‘alā minhāj awjaz mimmā dhakarnāh fī kitāb mīḥakk al-naṣar wa kitāb miyār al-‘ilm wa laysat hādhīh al-muqaddima min jumlat ‘ilm al-uṣūl wa lā min muqaddimātihī al-ḥāṣṣa bihī bal hiya muqaddimat al-‘ulūm kullihā wa-man lā yuhītu bihā falā thiqata bi ‘ulūmihī aslan.*” *Al-Muṣṭafā min ‘Ilm al-Uṣūl* (Cairo: Al-Maṭba‘a al-Amīriyya, 1322/1904) p. 10; QM, p. 1, l. 27.

by Sirāj al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī (d. 750/1349),²²⁹ al-Suyūtī, however, convincingly argues that al-Gazālī had retreated from this opinion.²³⁰

Furthermore, al-Suyūtī refers to *Iḥyā 'Ulūm al-Dīn*,²³¹ insisting that there are some passages in it where al-Gazālī censured logic.²³² Al-Suyūtī even relates that he composed two quires summarizing passages of *Iḥyā 'Ulūm al-Dīn* which dealt with the censure of logic.²³³

Without having referred to other works of al-Gazālī dealing with logic, such as *Tahāfut al-Falāsifa*, *Mīzān al-'Amal*, *Mi'yār al-'Ilm*, *Mihakk al-Nazar*,²³⁴ al-Suyūtī maintains that it is true that al-Gazālī once exhorted people to master logic, but then, al-Suyūtī suggests, he changed his opinion to censuring logic. Al-Suyūtī then argues that if a scholar has two different opinions, it is the second one which is to be referred to, while the first is to be regarded as one from which he had withdrawn.²³⁵

Furthermore, al-Suyūtī marshalled the argument of al-Nawawī, who was considered the highest authority in Shāfi'iite circles,²³⁶ and whose work, *Sharḥ al-Muhadhdhab*, was the most important reference in the Shāfi'iite school.²³⁷ According to al-Suyūtī, al-Nawawī (676/1277)²³⁸ in his *Tabaqāt*²³⁹ said that al-

²²⁹Sirāj al-Dīn 'Umar b. 'Alī b. 'Umar al-Qazwīnī was born in 683/1285 and died in 750/1349. Al-Suyūtī referred to him as the great ḥāfiẓ and the traditionist of Iraq. See al-Suyūtī, TH, 526.

²³⁰"wa qad raja'a 'an hādha 'l-qawl kamā naqalahu 'l-ḥāfiẓ sirāj al-dīn al-qazwīnī..." QM, p. 1, l. 22-3.

²³¹This work has been published several times and subjected to several studies, which need not to be enumerated here.

²³²"... thumma inna fī 'l-ḥiyā' mawādi'i lā tuḥṣā tadullu 'ala 'l-haṭṭ 'alayhī...' "wa annahū taqawwala 'alayhī bimā lam yaqul aw qālahu wa raja'a 'anhū..." QM, p. 4 (l. 11-12).

²³³"mā laḥhaṣtuhū minhu wa huwa nāḥwa kurrāsaynī mussawwad fīhi 'l-mawādi'i allatī fī 'l-ḥiyā' min-mā yadullu 'ala 'l-haṭṭ 'alayhī." QM, p. 4, l. 14-5.

²³⁴Elaborate discussion of these works can be found in Saeful Anwar, *Filsafat Ilmu Al-Gazālī: Analisis Tentang Dimensi Ontology, Epistemologi dan Aksiologi Ilmu Era Peripatetik* (Scientific Philosophy of al-Gazālī: An Analysis of Ontological, Epistemological and Axiological Dimensions of Science in the Peripatetical Era), unpublished dissertation (Yogyakarta, Indonesia, 2000).

²³⁵"wa qad taħarrara minhā annahū lam yaqul aħad bi-ibħatiħi illa 'l-gazālī - rađiya 'llāh 'anhū fī qawlīn raja'a 'anhū wa ma īum annahū idħā kāna li 'l-álim qawlān fa 'l-marjū' ilayhī huwa qawluhū [al-thāni], wa 'l-marjū' 'anhū ... lam yaqulhu..." QM, p. 12, l. 7-8.

²³⁶Heffening, W., "al-Nawawī" EI² VII, 1041.

²³⁷"wa qāla fī sharḥ al-muħadħħab - wa huwa ajallu kutubihī bal ajallu kutubi 'l-muħadħħab fī bāb al-bay'" QM, p. 2.l.12-13.

²³⁸Muhyī al-Dīn Abū Zakariyyā' Yahyā b. Sharaf b. Mirā b. Ḥasan b. Ḥusayn b. Muħammad b. Djum'a b. Ḥizām al-Ḥizāmī al-Dimashqī, who was born in Muħarram 631/October 1233 in Nawā south of Damascus and died on Wednesday, 24 Rajab 676/22 December 1277 in Nawā. Heffening, *op. cit.*, p. 1041-2.

²³⁹*Tabaqāt al-Fuqahā'*, according to Wüstenfeld, is an extract from a work by Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. In this biographical dictionary, which deals only with a very limited group of figures, al-Nawawī not only gives biographical information on less known scholars but also on their teachers. Wüstenfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 55-6; Muħtaṣar *Tabaqāt al-Fuqahā'*, ed. 'Ādil 'Abd al-Mawjūd (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Kutub al-Thaqāfiyya, 1995). According to the editor, this work is a fair copy made by al-Mizzī, who made a fair copy of *Muħtaṣar Tabaqāt al-Fuqahā'* by al-Nawawī, who had died before having completed it.

Gazālī's attempt to mix logic with *uṣūl al-fiqh* was considered a heresy.²⁴⁰ Al-Suyūṭī then quotes other statements of al-Nawawī, saying that the selling of books of logic and philosophy was not allowed. Such books should be destroyed instead.²⁴¹ In another passage, al-Suyūṭī also records al-Nawawī's quotation of al-Shāfi‘ī's celebrated statements against *kalām*: (1) “Any affliction by God, except *al-shirk*, is better for man than being afflicted by Him through *kalām*;” (2) “running away from *kalām* is like running away from a lion;” and (3) “my opinion on the people of *kalām* is that they should be beaten with the lash, and be paraded along the markets while summoning the people that this is the consequence of neglecting the science of *shari‘a*, for being occupied by *‘ilm al-kalām*.²⁴²

Al-Suyūṭī then quotes Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s (d.643/1245)²⁴³ *fatwā* in which the latter maintained that being occupied with learning and teaching logic is not allowed by the Law-giver, by the Companions, the Followers and by the leading scholars qualified to undertake *ijtihād*.²⁴⁴

Basing myself on the *Fatāwa*²⁴⁵ and al-Suyūṭī’s abridgement of some passages of it in QM, it should be noted that the response of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ is

²⁴⁰ “wa laqad atā bi ḥulṭihi ‘l-manṭiq bi uṣūl al-fiqh bid‘atan fī ḍammi shu’mihā ‘ala ‘l-manfa‘a ḥattā kathura ba‘da dhālikā fahm al-falsafa wa ‘llāh al-musta‘ān.” QM, p. 2, l. 9-11.

²⁴¹ “... lā yajūzu bay‘ kutub al-manṭiq wa ‘l-falsafa jazman bal yajibū itlāfuhā...” in QM, p. 2, l. 13.

²⁴² “la an yulqiya ‘llāh al-‘abd bikulli dhanbin mā ḥalā al-shirk ḥayrun lahū min an yalqāhū bi shay‘in min ‘ilm al-kalām, wa qawlūhū firra min ‘ilm al-kalām firāraka mina ‘l-asad, wa qawlūhū ra‘yī fī ahl al-kalām an yudrabū bi ‘l-jarīd wa yuṭāfa bihim fī ‘l-aswāq wa yunādiya ‘alayhim hādhā’ jazā‘u man yatrūku ‘ilma ‘l-shari‘a wa yashtagilu bi ‘ilm al-kalām...” QM, p. 3, l. 19-23.

²⁴³ Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ was born in 577/1181 in Irbil and died in Damascus in 643/1245. His *Muqaddimāt* *Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ fi ‘Ulūm al-Hadīth* was considered the standard work on the science of the Tradition, and was considered by al-Suyūṭī himself as one of the most knowledgeable persons of his time on Exegesis, Tradition and Jurisprudence. See al-Suyūṭī, TH, 500.

²⁴⁴ “wa laysa ‘l-iṣhtigāl bi ‘ilmihī wa ta‘limihī mimma abāḥahu ‘l-shari‘... al-sahāba wa ‘l-tabi‘īn wa ‘l-a‘imma al-mujtahidīn wa ‘l-‘ulamā‘ al-‘arifīn wa sā‘ir man yuqtadā bihim min a‘lām al-milla... qad bara‘a ‘llāh al-jamī‘ min ma‘arrati dhālikā wa adnāsihim wa ṭahharahum min awḍārihī wa amma ‘sti‘māl al-iṣṭilāḥāt al-manṭiqiyā fī mabāḥithi ‘l-kalām al-shari‘yya fa-min ... al-mustashni‘a wa laysa bi ‘l-ahkām al-shari‘yya wa ‘l-hamd li ‘llāh iftiqār ilā ‘l-manṭiq aslān wa mā za‘amahū al-manṭiqī li ‘l-manṭiq fī amr al-ḥujja wa ‘l-burhān fa-qāqi‘ qad agnā ‘llāh ‘anhā bi ‘l-tarīq al-aqwām wa ‘l-sabil al-aslam kulla muslim al-zuhd...hadīma nazariyyāt al-‘ulūm al-shari‘yya wa qad tammat al-shari‘a wa ‘ulūmuḥā wa ḥāḍa fī biḥār al-ḥaqā‘iq wa ‘l-raqā‘iq ‘ulamā‘ wa... lā manṭiqā wa lā falsafata wa man za‘ama annahū yashtagilu bi ‘l-manṭiq wa ‘l-falsafa li fā‘ida za‘amahā faqad ḥasira...wa mukira bihī. Fa ‘l-wājib ‘ala ‘l-sultān a‘azzāzahu ‘llāh wa a‘izza bihi ‘l-islām wa ahlalhū an yadfa‘a ‘an al-muslimīn sharra hā‘ulā’ wa... min al-madāris wa... wa yu‘riḍu min ẓahr minhu i‘tiqād ‘aqā‘id al-falāsifa ‘ala ‘l-sayf aw al-islām li tāhmidā nāruhum wa tanmāhī āthāruhum yassara ‘llāh dhālikā wa ‘ajjalahū wa min awjab al-wājib ‘azlu man kāna mudarris madrasat min ahl al-falsafa wa ‘l-taṣnīf fīhā wa ‘l-iqrā‘ bihā wa... wa ‘ntiṣāb mithlihī mudarrisan mina ‘l-azā‘im wa sijnuhū wa ilzāmuḥū bay‘ manzilhī wa in za‘ama zā‘im annahū gayr mu‘taqidin li ‘aqā‘idihim fa‘inna ḥālahū yakdhibuhū wa ‘l-tariq fī qat‘ al-sharr qal‘u uṣūlihī wa ‘llāh...” QM, p. 2, l. 14-26.

²⁴⁵ Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Sahrazūrī, *Fatāwa ibn al-Ṣalāḥ fi ‘l-Tafsīr wa ‘l-Hadīth wa ‘l-‘Aqā‘id* (Cairo: Idārat al-Ṭibā‘a al-Munīriyya, 1348), p. 4.

succinct but very fervent and harsh against logic and those who study and make use of it. Before delivering his response to questions posed to him, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ starts with his value judgment on philosophy and logic. In his opinion, philosophy is the basis of stupidity and disintegration, a source of confusion and error, and a stimulus of deviation and heresy.²⁴⁶ Logic, according to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, is an introduction to philosophy. Logic, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ infers, is as evil as philosophy because an introduction to evil is also evil.²⁴⁷

Then Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ declares that being occupied with studying and teaching logic is not legally justified. Not a single individual, he maintains, of the Companions, the Followers, the Pious Ancestors and the leading scholars who undertake *ijtihād* have deemed it permissible to be occupied with the study of logic and teaching it.²⁴⁸ As far as the use of logical terms in formulating divine laws is concerned, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ says it is one of the reprehensible actions and new stupidities.²⁴⁹

Without giving any further reason, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ asserts the superfluousness of logic and philosophy for the formulation of the divine laws, saying that those who hold that logic and philosophy must be studied for their benefits, must have been deceived by the Satan and led astray by Him. Logic and philosophy lead them to nothing but deprivation and banishment.²⁵⁰

Finally, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ recommends the Sultan to protect the people from the evil of those who are occupied with studying and teaching logic by taking certain measures: Banishing them from their schools, punishing them according to the degree of their involvement, and even killing them, if they have already come to a degree of knowledge comparable to that of philosophers.²⁵¹

This *fatwā*, according to Griffel, is not only evidence of the existence of the study of philosophy in the first half of 8th/13th century, but also constitutes the peak of the opposition to the philosophers, which had already been taken up by al-Gazālī with his *Tahāfut al-Falāsifa* more than one hundred fifty years earlier.²⁵² In Chamberlain's view, this fatwā is, however, an instrument of political competition, employed by Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ to gain the ruler's favour.²⁵³

Furthermore, al-Suyūṭī mentions the Shafi'iite al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348)²⁵⁴ who said in his *Zagal al-'Ilm*:²⁵⁵ "The benefit of logic is minute, while its harm is

²⁴⁶ *Fatāwā*, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

²⁴⁷ Ibidem.

²⁴⁸ Ibidem.

²⁴⁹ Ibidem.

²⁵⁰ Ibidem.

²⁵¹ Ibidem; QM, p. 2, l. 16-26.

²⁵² Griffel, *op. cit.*, p. 354-8.

²⁵³ Chamberlain, Michael, *Knowledge and Social Practice in medieval Damascus, 1190-1350* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 174-5.

²⁵⁴ Shams al-Din Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. 'Uthmān b. Qaymāz b. 'Abd Allāh al-Turkumānī al-Fāriqī al-Dimashqī al-Shāfi'ī was born in ca. 673/1274 and died in Damascus in 748/1348. He specifically excelled in three fields of research: Tradition, canon law and history. Al-Suyūṭī referred to him as the "traditionist of the age" and "the seal of the *háfiẓs*" and considered him "*al-Imām al-Háfiẓ, Muḥaddith al-'Asr, wa Hātimat al-Huffāz, wa Mu'arriḥ al-Islām, wa Fard al-Dahr, wa 'l-Qā'im bi a'bā' hādhīhī al-*

great. Logic is not one of the sciences of Islam. Hide the truth which is deduced from [logic] in your soul, and avoid any triviality which is born in it.”²⁵⁶

According to al-Suyūtī, al-Dhahabī reported in his *Mu‘jam*,²⁵⁷ that Kamāl al-Dīn Abu ‘l-Qāsim ‘Umar b. Ilyās b. Yūnus al-Marāgī al-Šūfī (d. ca. 730/1330)²⁵⁸ used to sit next to the Shi‘ite scholar Ḥwājā Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī (d. 672/1274)²⁵⁹ [and to attend the lessons of ‘Afif al-Dīn al-Tilimsānī (d. 690/1291).]²⁶⁰ Then al-Marāgī read *al-mawāqif* (by al-Niffarī, d. 354/965)²⁶¹ to al-Tilimsānī. Then he reached a passage which was against the Shari‘a. So [to know his attitude,] I asked al-Tūsī. He replied: “If you want to know the science of the people (*‘ilm al-qawm*), you must take the Shari‘a, the Book and the Sunna and throw away [the *Mawāqif*] and discard it.” [Al-Marāgī then said:] “From then on, I hated him and stayed aloof from him.”²⁶² Dealing with the Hanbalite Taqī al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Sātīr (d. 679/1281),²⁶³ according to al-Suyūtī, al-Dhahabī said in *Siyar al-Nubalā*:²⁶⁴ “He

Sinā‘a...” Ben Cheneb, Moh and J. De Somogyi, “al-Dhahabī,” EI², II, 214-216; See al-Suyūtī, TH, 517-9.

²⁵⁵This work was published under the title *Bayān Zagal al-‘Ilm wa ‘l-Talab* (Damascus: Maṭba‘at al-Tawfiq, 1347/1929), ed. M.Z. al-Kawtharī.

²⁵⁶“... *al-manṭiq naf‘uhū qalil wa ḍararuhū wabil, wa [laysa] huwa min ‘ulūm al-islām...wa l-haqq min kāmin fī al-nufūs ... wa ‘l-bāṭil minhu fā ‘hrib minhu” QM, p. 2, l. 27-9.*

²⁵⁷In TH, al-Suyūtī gives two versions of *Mu‘jam*: *kabīr* and *sagīr*. See al-Suyūtī, TH, 518: *Mu‘jam Shuyūḥ al-Dhahabī*, ed. Rūhiyya ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Suyūfī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1990); *Tahqīq al-Mu‘jam al-Muhtassib*, ed. Muḥammad al-Habīb al-Hayla (Tā’if: Maktabat al-Šiddīq, 1988).

²⁵⁸‘Umar b. Ilyās b. Yūnus al-Marāgī Abu ‘l-Qāsim al-Šūfī Kamāl al-Dīn was born in Azerbayjān in 643/1246 and died in Damascus ca. 730/1330. He was given a certificate of proficiency of Tradition by al-‘Izz al-Harrānī, Muḥammad b. Tarajjum, Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Baydāwī. Among his disciples were al-Dhahabī and Jalāl al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī. Ibn Ḥajar, DK, III, 232.

²⁵⁹Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī who was born on 11 Jumādā I 597/17 Feb. 1201 and died in Bagdad on 18 Dhu ‘l-Hijja 672/25 June 1274, according to Daiber, was the most important and influential Shi‘ite scholar in the fields of mathematics, geometry, astronomy, philosophy and theology. He was referred to by scholars of later generations as *al-mu‘allim al-thālith*, “the third teacher” after Aristotle and al-Fārābī. Daiber, H.[Ragep, F.J.], “al-Tūsī, Naṣīr al-Dīn,” EI², X, 746-752.

²⁶⁰Sulaymān b. ‘Alī b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Alī ‘Afif al-Dīn al-Tilimsānī, the humanist and sufist was the author of *Sharḥ al-Asmā’ al-Ḥusnā*, *Sharḥ Manāzil al-Sā’irīn* and *Sharḥ Mawāqif al-Niffarī*. See Muḥammad b. Shākir al-Kutubī, *Fawāt bi ‘l-Wafayāt* (FW) ed. Dr. Ihsan ‘Abbās (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1973), vol. II, 72-6. Relying on Ibn Ḥajar’s DK, I added al-Tilimsānī. See Ibn Ḥajar, DK, III, 232, l. 10-14.

²⁶¹According to Arberry, Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Jabbār b. al-Ḥasan al-Niffarī was born in Niffar, one of the provinces of al-Baṣra. *Kitāb al-Mawāqif*, his work dealing with the spiritual positions, was edited by A.J. Arberry (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935) and translated into French by Mohamed Oudaimah (Paris: Arfuyen, 1982).

²⁶²“jālastu ḥwājā naṣīr al-dīn al-tūsī wa qara’tu ‘alayh fī ‘l-mawāqif fajā’ mawdī‘ yuhālīfū al-shar‘ fahāqaqtuhū fa-qāla anta turīdu an ta‘rifā ‘ilm al-qawm fa-ḥudh al-shar‘ wa ‘l-kitāb wa ‘l-sunna falafhā wa ‘trahhā fa-maqattuhū wa ‘nqāṭa’tu min dhālikā ‘l-yawm.” QM, p. 4, l. 22-4; the text of this report can also be read in Ibn Ḥajar’s DK (III, 232, l. 10-14) in the biography of al-Marāgī, on the basis of which I could render the text more comprehensible.

²⁶³‘Abd al-Sātīr b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd b. Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr b. Mādī al-Maqdisī, Taqī al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad was born ca. 600/1204 and died in 679/1281. He studied

who reads *Kitāb al-Shifā*²⁶⁵ [by Ibn Sīnā] becomes a heretic as also he who studies alchemy becomes bankrupt.²⁶⁶ He who does not fear his God, will not gain any benefit from his knowledge.”²⁶⁷

Al-Suyūtī then refers to Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (d. 463/1071),²⁶⁸ whose censure on logic can be found in his statement: “The sciences of the ancients are a malady for religion. No single clue of guidance, reward, present life and hereafter can be found in them,”²⁶⁹ and then to Ibn Daqīq al-‘Id (d.702/1302),²⁷⁰ who said that evil originates from five things, one of which is the sciences of the ancients.²⁷¹

Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 756/1355)²⁷² is also referred to by al-Suyūtī as having opposed logic. When he was asked about the study of logic, al-Suyūtī reports, al-Subkī said: “Being occupied with the Book, the Sunna and the

Jurisprudence under Taqī al-Dīn b. al-‘Izz and learned Tradition from Mūsā b. ‘Abd al-Qādir, Ibn al-Zubaydī, Muwaffaq al-Dīn, etc. He was accused of being an antropomorphist who feuded against the Ash‘arites in favour of the Hanbalites. See Ibn Rajab, DTH, II, 298-9.

²⁶⁴ *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* (SAN) ed. Shu‘ayb al-Arnāt (Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risāla, 1981-1988), 25 vols.

²⁶⁵ *Kitāb al-Shifā’* (book of the healing [of the soul]) is one of the two principle works - besides *al-Qanūn fī al-Tibb* (canon of medicine) of Ibn Sīnā which made him an undisputed master in medicine, natural science and philosophy.(Goichon, “Ibn Sīnā, EI², III, 941-7). According to Yāsīn, the book was written because of (1) the urge of Ibn Sīnā’s disciples who asked him to write a comprehensive encyclopaedia in philosophy; (2) the defence of the intelectual dispute in which he was engaged; and (3) his inclination to and keenness on being occupied with Greek sciences. See Yāsīn, Ja‘far ‘Alī, *Faylasūf ‘Ālim: Dirāsa Tahllīyya li Hayāt ibn Sīnā wa Fikrīh al-Falsafī* (Beirut: Dār al-Andalus, 1984/1404) 1st ed., 74-5.

²⁶⁶This is in line with the words of Ibn Haldūn that “*man ṭalaba al-kīmiyā’ ṭalaban sīnā’iyyān ḍayya’ā mālahū wa ‘amalahū...*” *Muqaddima* Ibn Haldūn (Dār al-Fikr), p. 530. Wiedeman has collected the arguments by leading scholars against the study of alchemy, one of whom was ‘Abd al-Latīf, who said: “Verily, most men have been ruined by the work of Ibn Sīnā and by alchemy.” See Wiedeman, E., “al-Kīmiyā’ in EI¹, II, 110-17; Anawati, G.C., “Arabic Alchemy,” in EHAS, III, ed. Roshdi Rashed (London & New York: Routledge, 1996), p. 853-885.

²⁶⁷“*man qara’ā al-shifa’ tazandaqa kamā anna man tatallaba al-kīmiyā’ aflasa, wa-man lam yattaqi rabbahū lam yanfa’hu ‘ilmuhū.*” QM, p. 6, l. 7-8.

²⁶⁸The greatest traditionist in Al-Andalus, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr was born in Cordoba on 24 Rabi‘ II 368/30 November 978 and died on 29 Rabi‘ II 463/3 February 1071. GAL, I. 368, S. I, 628.

²⁶⁹“*‘ulūm al-awā’il marad fī al-dīn ..., wa laysa fīhā hudā wa lā ajr wa lā dunyā wa lā āhira.*” QM, p. 3, l.2-3.

²⁷⁰The brightest figure of his time excelling in Jurisprudence and Tradition, Taqī al-Dīn Abu ’l-Faṭḥ Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. Wahb b. Mutī‘ b. Abi ’l-Tā‘a was born in Ḥijāz in Sha‘bān 625/July 1228 and died in Cairo on 11 Ṣafar 702/1302. Ebied, R.Y., “Ibn Dakīk al-Īd,” EI², Suppl., 383; al-Suyūtī, TH, 513.

²⁷¹“*innamā dhala ‘ala ‘I-nās al-āfat min ḥamsat ashyā’ wa ‘adda minhā ‘ulūma ‘I-awā’il.*” QM, p. 3, l. 6-7.

²⁷²A *mujtahid* in whom the rank of *ijtihād* in Holy Law, in Prophetic tradition and in Arabic language were united, Ahmād b. ‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-Kāfi b. ‘Alī b. Tamām al-Subkī al-‘Allāma Bahā’ al-Dīn Abū Ḥāmid b. *Shayh al-Islām* Taqī al-Dīn Abu ’l-Ḥasan was born in Jumāda II 20, 719/1320 and died on Thursday Rajab 20, 756/1355. Al-Suyūtī, BW, *op. cit.*, p. 148-9; Al-Suyūtī, TH, 521-2; Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

Jurisprudence is of greater importance than being occupied with logic.²⁷³ According to al-Suyūtī, al-Subkī had said in his *Tabaqāt*²⁷⁴ that Abu 'l-'Alā' al-'Attār (d. 569/1174),²⁷⁵ whose surname was 'Aqbada, was asked whether it was allowed to be occupied with logic. He answered: "Logic has nothing to do with imposition (*kallun*)²⁷⁶ and belief. It is better that one is not occupied with it, as it may lead one into something which is superfluous."²⁷⁷

Al-Adfuwī's (d. 748/1347)²⁷⁸ censure against logic is recorded in his *Kitāb Farā'id wa Maqāṣid al-Qawā'id*²⁷⁹ in which he, according to al-Suyūtī, reported the attitudes of two authorities against logic: Abu 'l-Abbās b. al-Munayyar al-Iskandarī (d. 803/1401)²⁸⁰ and Ibn Taymiyya. According to al-Adfuwī, al-Iskandarī had composed a work against logic. Without identifying Ibn Taymiyya's individual works against logic,²⁸¹ al-Adfuwī stated that Ibn Taymiyya had composed two such works. According to al-Suyūtī, in their respective works, al-Iskandarī and Ibn Taymiyya upheld the idea that logic was not an introduction to philosophy.²⁸²

²⁷³ "wa su'ilā 'anh al-shayḥ taqī al-dīn al-subkī faqāla yanbagī an yuqaddama 'alā dhālikā al-ishtigāl bi l-kitāb wa l-sunna wa l-fiqh..." QM, p. 3, l. 9-10.

²⁷⁴ According to al-Suyūtī, al-Subkī had composed more than 250 works, among which *al-Tabaqāt al-Kubrā*, *Sharḥ Muhtaṣar ibn al-Hājib* and *Sharḥ al-Minhāj*. See al-Suyūtī, BW, *op. cit.*, p. 149; Al-Suyūtī, TH, 521-2.

²⁷⁵ Abu 'l-'Alā' al-Hamadhānī al-Ḥasan b. Ahmad b. al-Ḥasan b. Ahmad b. Sahl al-'Attār, *Shayḥ Hamadhān*, was born in 488/1096 and died in 569/1174. Al-Suyūtī, TH, 473-4.

²⁷⁶ According to Ibn Manzūr, *kallun* refers to *al-thaqal min kull mā yutakallaf*. *Lisān*, V, 3920.

²⁷⁷ "... al-manṭiq lā yata'allaqu bihī kallun wa lā īmānun. Wa l-awlā an lā yushtagala bihī, li annahū lā ya'manu li hā'id fihī an yajurrahū ilā mā lā yanbagī..." QM, p. 3, l.7-8; Another *fatwā* by al-Subkī against logic can be found in Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī, *Fatāwā al-Subkī* (Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifa, 1980), 644-5; Its translation can be found in Rosenthal, F., *Das Fortleben der Antike im Islam* (Zürich and Stuttgart: Artemis Verlag, 1965), 115-117.

²⁷⁸ The celebrated philologist and jurist who studied under the supervision of Ibn Daqīq al-Īd and Abū Hayyān al-Garnātī, al-Adfuwī was born in 685/1286 and died in Ṣafar 10, 748/May 23, 1347 in Cairo. GAL, II, 31.

²⁷⁹ According to Brockelmann, this work deals with the obligation (*al-fard*), as a foundation of *al-furū'*. It is a commentary on the unknown *Muqaddima* by al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277). See GAL, II, 31.

²⁸⁰ Ibn al-Munayyar is Nāṣir al-Dīn Abu 'l-Abbās Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Manṣūr al-Iskandarī, who was referred to by al-Suyūtī as one of the leading scholars qualified to undertake *ijtihād*. He was born in 620/1224 and died in Alexandria in 803/1401. Al-Suyūtī, HM, I, 316-7.

²⁸¹ The works of Ibn Taymiyya which al-Adfuwī refers to here are probably *Kitāb al-Radd 'ala l-Manṭiqiyyīn* (Bombay: al-Maṭba'a al-Qayyima, 1949), ed. Sharaf al-Dīn al-Kutubī, and *al-Manṭiq wa l-Halal fīh* (Mss, 3845 (187-189), Maktaba al-Asad, Damascus, Syria)

²⁸² "wa qāla...al-adfuwī...kitāb lahū sammāhū farā'id al-fawā'id qad ṣannafa abu 'l-abbās ibn al-munayyar al-iskandarī kitāban fī l-radd 'ala l-manṭiq wa ṣannafa fihī ibn taymiyya kitābayn lākinna qawlāhum annahū madḥal al-falsafa yuraddu 'alayhim aw 'ilm al-kalām kadhālikā." QM, p. 3, l. 16-18.

In his *al-Tawakkul fī al-Radd ila 'l-Amr al-Awwal*²⁸³ Abū Shāma al-Dimashqī (d.665/1268)²⁸⁴ said that it is better to avoid the destructive effects and the logical complexities of *kalām*, which drive people away from virtues.²⁸⁵

In his *Naṣīḥat al-Muṣlim al-Muṣfiq li man Ubtuliya bi Ḥubb 'Ilm al-Manṭiq* Sirāj al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī (d.750/1349) had warned people not to be fascinated by logic.²⁸⁶ Al-Suyūtī also reports that al-Qazwīnī in his book *al-Hatt 'ala 'l-Manṭiq* described an event where the leading scholars, jurists, lecturers and literary men gathered in a circle in the presence of the Sultan and were occupied with something which harmed them much. Furthermore, one who claimed himself to be closest to the Sultan and the most knowledgeable maintained that one of the conditions to be *mujtahid* was the knowledge of logic. He then said that this view belonged to al-Gazālī. The people were silent and no one had the audacity to refute him. Finally, one of them awoke and voiced his idea in reference to a view which he claimed to belong to Imām al-Gazālī, who rejected logic. Censuring logic, in the last passage of his report, al-Qazwīnī concluded that one had ascribed to al-Gazālī a view which the latter did not hold.²⁸⁷

²⁸³ *Muhtasar al-Mu'ammal fī al-Radd ila 'l-Amr al-Awwal* ed. Ş.M. Ahmad (Kuwait, 1983). This work has been dealt with by Konrad Hirschler, "Pre-eighteenth-Century traditions of revivalism: Damascus in the thirteenth Century," in Bulletin of SOAS, 68, 2 (2005) 195-214.

²⁸⁴ The *Mujtahid* Shihāb al-Dīn Abu 'l-Qāsim 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ismā'īl al-Makdisī was born in Damascus on 23 Rabī' II 599/10 January 1203 and died on 19 Ramādān 665/13 June 1268. See Von Grunebaum, G.E., "Abū Shāma," EI², I, 150; al-Suyūtī, *al-Taḥadduth, op. cit.*, p. 65.

²⁸⁵"wa qad nabaga āharūn yarawna anna 'l-lawlā al-iqtisār 'alā nukath ḥilāfiyya waḍā 'ūhā wa ashkāl mantiqiyya allafūhā a'rādū 'an al-mahāsin wa sammū fuqahā'a 'l-madhab kawādin wa dhālikā min 'alāmati 'l-hudhlan na 'ūdhū bi 'llāh min tādīr' al-zamān fī 'l-jidāl wa 'l-marā' wa nas'aluhū al-thabāt 'ala 'l-tamassuk bi 'l-athar."QM, p. 3, l. 24-6.

²⁸⁶This is taken from what the title of his work suggests: "naṣīḥat al-muṣlim al-muṣfiq li man ubtuliya bi ḫubb 'ilm al-manṭiq."QM, p. 1, l. 23.

²⁸⁷"hādhīh suṣūr jama'tuhā fī hādhīhi 'l-awraq li-mā ḥadatha mina 'l-kalām fī majlisin ijta'mā fīhi 'l-aimma wa 'l-'ulamā' wa 'l-mudarrisūn wa 'l-fuqahā' wa 'l-udaba' fī ḥadrat sultānihim wa jam' sha'nihim fahādū fīmā yaḍurruhum kathīran wa-in za'amū annahū yanfa'u hum qalīlān, ḥatta 'dda'ā man za'ama annahū aqrabahum ila 'l-sultān wa a'lamuhum fī hādhā al-zamān anna min sharṭ al-mujtahid fī 'l-'ulūm al-shar'iyya an ya'rifa 'l-manṭiq wa 'azā dhālikā ila 'l-imām al-Gazālī wa sakata 'l-jamā'a 'an al-radd 'alayhī illā man waffaqahu 'llāh ta'ālā ... hum liḥawfihim minhu wa ṭam'ihim fīhi haythu kāna mutawallī umūri awqāfihim... hadrat sultānihim fā ankara dhālikā 'alayh min... wa min nisbatihī ila 'l-imām al-Gazālī uḥrā wa mina 'l-ma'lūm 'ind ahl... wa arbāb al-naql bi 'l-istiqrā' mina 'l-salaf al-ṣāliḥ wa 'l-a'imma al-mādīn inkāruhum al-ishtigāl bi 'ilm al-kalām faharramūh marratan wa-karrahūh uḥrā... al-nahy 'anhu... bi 'l-manṭiq alladhī yaḥtawī 'alā masā'il... ijmā'an mimman tābā min 'ulamā'... ḥattā anna ba'da salātīna miṣr ḥabba min... bi fatwā sulāḥā 'ulamā' baladīh fākataba ba'duhum baytayn wa alṣaqahumā 'alā ṣadrihī: naṭīqa 'l-fatā' al-bagy awjaba hatfahū #lammā tagālā fī 'ulūm al-manṭiq. ṣānat maqālatan min garāmatin... talā # inna 'l-balā' muwakkalun bi 'l-manṭiq. Wa min a'jabī 'l-ajab annahū ja'ala 'l-manṭiq min shurūṭi 'l-ijtihād wa-dayya'a 'umrahū fīhi wa taraka gayrahū mina 'l-shurūṭ al-mujma' 'alayhā min ma'rīfat al-kitāb wa 'l-sunna wa 'l-sīrat... thumma inna fi 'l-ḥiyā' mawāḍī' lā tuḥṣā tadullu 'ala 'l-ḥaṭṭ 'alayhī fanaqaltu dhālikā... 'anhu al-thanā' 'alayhī... liyakūna ḥujjatan 'alayhī fīmā naqalahū 'anhū wa annahū taqawwala 'alayhī bimā lam yaqul aw qālahū wa raja'a 'anhū li'allā yugtarra bihī wa lā yashtagila bihādha 'l-fann wa yatrūka 'ilm al-tafsīr wa 'l-hadīth wa 'l-fiqh illā man

Then follows al-Silafī (d. 576/1180)²⁸⁸ who said that: (1) logic is a reprehensible art²⁸⁹ and (2) the transmission [of religious knowledge] by one who is occupied with logic cannot be accepted.²⁹⁰ These two statements are quoted by al-Suyūtī from *Mu'jam al-Safār*.²⁹¹

When Ibn Rashīd (d. 721/1322)²⁹² travelled to Egypt, according to al-Suyūtī, he found that the scholars of Tradition avoided Sayf al-Dīn 'Isā b. 'Alī al-Hawārizmī al-Bagdādī (d. 705/1306),²⁹³ because the latter was engaged in the sciences of the ancients and distinguished in Logic, which was considered by the people as a disgusting and abominable art.²⁹⁴

Then follows Abū Ḥayyān al-Garnātī (d. 745/1344),²⁹⁵ whose *al-Nuḍār* was referred to by al-Suyūtī as a work which was composed to report his early beginnings, his activities, his teachers and his flight from Granada.²⁹⁶ The most notable reason why Abū Ḥayyān fled from Granada, as recorded in *al-Nuḍār*, was that the scholar Muḥammad b. 'Iṣām al-Asadī who was well-versed in logic, arithmetic and geometry had said to the Sultan: "I have become an old man. I am worried about my death. Thus, I should like to teach these sciences to some disciples [of mine] to follow [my footsteps] so that the Sultan might [also] benefit from them after my death."²⁹⁷

hadhalahu 'llāh ta'ālā fī dunyāhū wa āḥiratihī wa in lam yaqul bi hādhīhi 'l-maqāla ahadun mina 'l-salaf wa 'l-halaf bal bālagū fī 'l-linkār." QM, p. 3 (l. 27) – 4 (l. - 14).

²⁸⁸ One of the most outstanding pupils of *Imām al-Haramayn*, Abū Tāhir al-Silafī was born in Isfahān in 472/1078-9 and died in Alexandria on 5 Rajab II 576/28 August 1180. See Gilliot, "al-Silafī, EI², IX, p. 607-9.; cf, Al-Ṣafadī, WW, VII, 351-6; al-Silafī, Abū Tāhir, *Mu'jam al-Safār*, ed. Dr.S.M. Zaman (Islamabad: Islamic Research Institute, 1988), p. 32.

²⁸⁹ "al-mantiq fannun madhmūmun wa qalla man yashra' fīhi wa yaslam min alsinati 'l-nās wa man yuridi 'llāh bihī hayran awqafahū li 'l-'ulūm al-mardiyya al-dīniyya." QM, p. 4, l. 16.

²⁹⁰ "... lā tuqbalu riwāyatuhū..." QM, p. 17, l. 18.

²⁹¹ This work was published in Islamabad in 1988 and edited by S.M. Zaman.

²⁹² A very distinguished figure in the science of Tradition, Muḥammad b. 'Umar b. Muḥammad b. 'Umar b. Muḥammad b. Idrīs b. Sa'īd b. Maṣ'ūd b. Hasan b. Muḥammad b. 'Umar b. Rashīd al-Fahrī al-Sibṭī Abū 'Abd Allāh Muhib al-Dīn, known as Ibn Rashīd, was born in Sibṭata in 657/1260 and died in Fez in Muḥarram 721/1322. Al-Suyūtī, BW, 85; Al-Suyūtī, TH, 524-5.

²⁹³ Sayf al-Dīn 'Isā b. 'Alī al-Hawārizmī al-Bagdādī was born ca. 630/1231. He was the teacher of al-Subkī and Ibn al-Akfānī, when he was appointed a professor at al-Madrasa al-Zāhiriyya. He was well-versed in logic. He died in 705/1306. Ibn Ḥajar, DK, III, 281-2.

²⁹⁴ "...dahaltu ilā misr, fawajadtu bihā sayf al-dīn 'isā b. 'alī al-hawārizmī al-bagdādī shayḥ...fa-lam... shay'an... li anna ahl al-hadīth aṣḥabuhū kāna lahum nufūr 'anhu li'uküfihi 'ala 'l-'ulūm al-qadīma wa tamayyuzih bisinā'at al-mantiq allatī jama'at 'ind al-āmma bishā'at 'l-ism wa shanā'at 'l-wahm." QM, p. 4, l. 18-21.

²⁹⁵ The most distinguished Arab grammarian of the first half of the 14th century the Malikite Abū Ḥayyān was born in Granada, Shawwāl 654/ November 1256, and died in Cairo, in Ṣafar 745/July 1344. See Glazer, S., "Abū Ḥayyān al-Gharnātī," EI², I, 126; al-Safadī, WW, V, 267; Al-Suyūtī, BW, 121-3.

²⁹⁶ "wa ra'aytu fī kitābihī al-nuḍār alladhihī allafahū fī dhikr mabda'ihi wa 'shtigālihī wa shuyūhihī wa rīḥlatihī anna mimmā qawā' azmuḥū 'ala 'l-riḥla 'an garnāṭa..." Al-Suyūtī, BW, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

²⁹⁷ "taqaddama fī 'ulūmi 'l-awā'il mina 'l-mantiq wa 'l-hisāb wa 'l-handasa fa qāla li 'l-sultān innī shayḥun kabīrun wa qāṣdī an yashtagila 'alayya ṭalabatun bi 'l-'ulūm li

According to al-Suyūtī, the *Shayh* Abū Ḥayyān in his *al-Nuḍār* also stated about Ibn Rushd (d. 592/1198), the philosopher, that he was avoided by the people and that no one wanted to transmit on his authority. This was because of the fact that he was occupied by the sciences of the ancients, either philosophical or logical.²⁹⁸ He had been attacked by Abū ‘Amir b. Rabī‘ and other scholars who had induced al-Manṣūr (d. 595/1199)²⁹⁹ to be against those who were occupied with these sciences, among whom were Ibn Rushd and Abū Ja‘far al-Dhahabī al-Balansī. The anger of al-Manṣūr, according al-Suyūtī, was reflected by the fact that the former incinerated the books of logic and philosophy.³⁰⁰

Based on the story found in *al-Nuḍār* by Abū Ḥayyān, al-Suyūtī remarked that one of those who had induced al-Manṣūr to commit such an act and had sided with the latter against Ibn Rushd (d. 592/1198) *et. al.* was Abu ’l-Hasan Muḥammad b. Jubayr al-Kinānī (d. 614/1217),³⁰¹ whose verses against the sciences of the ancients were recorded by al-Suyūtī in his QM as follows:

Our Caliph – may God reward you for your reconciliation [to the Will of
God] and your noble action
With regard to a fight which you undertook against them, finally you
achieved great victory
You distinguish mankind with the excellence of ... and by following the
straight way
He fought against the people who have gone astray from the way of the
Shari‘a due to the ‘old science’
And incinerate their books in the East and the West because in those
books there existed the most evil of the sciences
Which creeps into the beliefs ... if ... the poison ... the beliefs were like
swords
People like them, unless The sword is the antidote³⁰²

²⁹⁸ ‘ilmihim yaḥdumūna ‘I-sulṭān bihā idhā mittu fā ajābahū ilā dhālikā wa ashāra ilā ... aḥad tilka ‘I-ṭalaba wa an yakūna lī rātib jayyid wa kusā wa iḥsān wa in ‘ām fatamanna ‘tu min dhālikā wa kariḥtu ‘I-ishtigāl bi-tilka ‘I-ulūm athartu ‘I-safar mahāfatan an ukrihā ‘ala ‘I-ishtigāl bihā.” QM, p. 5, l. 25-8.

²⁹⁹ “ishtagala bi ‘ulūm al-awā’il al-falsafiyya wa ‘I-manṭiqiyya fā a‘raḍa ‘I-nās ‘anhu wa takallamū fihi wa taraku ‘I-riwayata ‘anhu.” QM, p. 4, l. 25-6.

³⁰⁰ Abū Yūsuf Ya‘qub b. Yūsuf b. ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn al-Manṣūr was the third ruler of the Mu’mīnid Almohad dynasty. He reigned from 580/1184 till 595/1199. See Miranda, A. H., “Abū Yūsuf Ya‘qub,” in EI², I, 165-66.

³⁰¹ “... wa agrā’ bihi ‘I-manṣūr fahariqa kutuba ‘I-mantiq wa ‘I-falsafa...” QM, p. 4, l. 26.

³⁰² Abu ’l-Hasan Muḥammad b. Jubayr al-Kinānī, an Andalusian traveler and writer who was born in Valencia in 540/1145, hailed from a family which had settled in Spain in 123/740. He was the author of *Rihla* which is, according to Pellat, the first and one of the best of the works of this kind which served as a model to the later authors, one of whom was Ibn Baṭṭūta. He died in Alexandria on 27 Sha‘bān 614/29 November 1217. Pellat, Ch., “Ibn Djubayr,” EI², III, 755. Ibn Jubayr’s harsh judgment on logic, according to Goldziher, was closely connected to his contact with orthodox circles in the East. Referring to *Futūḥat al-Makkiyya* by Ibn al-‘Arabī, Goldziher also suggests the presence of Ibn Jubayr, who behaved in a very dignified way at the funeral of Ibn Rushd. Goldziher, *op. cit.*, p. 201, 214.

³⁰³ halifatunā jazāka Ilāh hayran ‘an al-islām wa ‘I-sa‘yi ‘I-karīm; nahwa jihādihī jāhadta fihimm ilā an fuzta bi ‘I-fath al-‘azīm; wa mayyazta ‘I-ānām biḥusn hādhīhi... wa nahj al-

According to al-Suyūtī, Ibn Jubayr then said:

Caliph of God you are right, withdraw from happiness with the best of
your encouragement

You protected religion against one who abandoned it and against every one who
wishes a rupture in it

God informed you about the secret of the people who were unhappy due to their
being heavily covered with hypocrisy

They pretended to be philosophers and claimed [to master] sciences whose master
himself is miserable in the Hereafter

They disdained the Shari‘a and scorned it shamelessly and stupidly

You heap curse and shame on them; and you say: away with them and to hell with
them!

So stay for the religion of God ... because as long as you stay, it will remain as
well

In another passage, he also said:

Pass judgment by executing those who philosophized their [religious] tenets
heretically

With logic they were occupied. So it can be said in a true manner that the trial
was represented by logic

A sect has come forth in our age, a bane to it, [saying]
In religion follow only the creed of Ibn Sīnā or Abū Naṣr³⁰³

Danger to Islam from a sect which busies minds with folly;

It has cast the true religion behind its back and claims to possess wisdom
and philosophy.³⁰⁴

sīrāt al-mustaqīm; fajāhada fī unās qad adallū ṭarīqa ‘l-shar‘ bi ‘l-ilm al-qadīm; wa ḥarraqa kutubahum shargan wa garban fā-fīhā kā’inan sharra ‘l-ulūmm yadibbu ila ‘l-aqā’id idhā... al-sumūmm wa ‘l-aqā’id ka ‘l-husūmm wa fī amthālīhim idh lā ... yakūn al-sayf tiryāq al-sumūmm.”QM, p. 4 (l. 30) – 5 (l. 1-6).

³⁰³Abū Naṣr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Tarḥān b. Awzalagh al-Fārābī was referred to by Walzer as “one of the most outstanding and renowned Muslim philosophers,” “the second teacher,” the first being Aristotle. He died in 339/950. Walzer, R., “al-Fārābī,” EI², II, 778-81.

³⁰⁴[*halifata ʻllāh*] anta ḥaqqaqā fāriq min al-sa‘ad bayra maraqqa; ḥamaytum al-dīn min [‘iddihī] wa kullī man rāma [fīhi fatqa]; aṭla‘aka ʻllāh sirra [qawmin] shaqaw li‘isābi ‘l-nifāq shaqqa; tafalsafū wa ‘ddā‘ū ‘ulūman ṣāḥibuhā fī ‘l-ma‘ād yashqā; wa ‘htaqaru ‘l-shar‘ wa ‘zdarūh safāhatan minhum wa ḥamqan; awsa‘tahum la‘natan wa ḥizyan wa qulta bu‘dan lahum wa suhqan; [fā ‘bqā] li dīni ʻllāh kahfān fa‘innahū mā baqayta yabqā; naffidh al-qadā‘ bi aḥdh kullī man huwa mutafalsif fī dīnihī mutazandiq; bi ‘l-mantiq ishtagalū faqila haqīqatan inna ‘l-balā‘ muwakkalun bi ‘l-mantiq; qad zaharat fī ‘aṣrinā firqatun ẓuhūruhā shu‘m ‘ala ‘l-‘aṣr; lā taqtadī fī ‘l-dīn illā bimā sanna ibn sīnā aw abū naṣr; yā wahshata ‘l-islām min firqa shāgila anfusahā bi ‘l-safah; qad nabadhat dīna ‘l-hudā halfaḥā wa ‘ddā‘ati ‘l-ḥikma wa ‘l-falsafa.”QM, p. 5, l. 8-23; I have taken the words in the square bracket from *al-Mawsū‘a al-Shī‘iyya*, Majma‘ al-Thaqafī version 3.0. The verses are probably quoted by al-Suyūtī from *Nazm al-Jummān fī al-Tashakkī min Iḥwān al-Zamān* by Ibn Jubayr. The translation of the last four verses are quoted from A.S. Tritton,

In another passage, al-Suyūtī reports that Abū Hayyān, when talking about the biography of Muḥammad b. ‘Iṣām al-Asadī in his *al-Nuḍār*, said that al-Asadī was occupied with teaching his students the sciences [of the ancients] through which they could serve the Sultan.³⁰⁵ But with the passage of time, he felt disgusted to have been occupied with those sciences.³⁰⁶

Al-Suyūtī refers to Sharaf al-Dīn al-Dimyātī (d. 705/1306)³⁰⁷ who had said that if *kalām* (lit: “speaking” or “disputing”) and logic necessitate evil, being silent is a virtue,³⁰⁸ and to al-Asnawī (d. 772/1371)³⁰⁹ who remarked in his *al-Muhimmāt* that books of logic and philosophy can be used during the *istinja’*. According to al-Asnawī, books of logic and philosophy had no sacred value.³¹⁰ Al-Asnawī’s attitude towards logic, al-Suyūtī argues, was affirmed by al-Adhrā‘ī (d. 603/1205)³¹¹ and the *Shayh* Walī al-Dīn Abū Zur‘a Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Rahīm al-Wazīr al-‘Irāqī (d. 826/1423),³¹² as can be read in *Muhtasar al-Muhimmāt wa Nukatih*,³¹³ and by Chief Judge Sharaf al-Dīn al-Bayḍāwī (d. 716/1316) in *Hāshiyat Sharh al-Bahja*.³¹⁴

The poem of Zayn al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 735/1335)³¹⁵ against logic is also referred to by al-Suyūtī in his QM:

Materials on Muslim Education in the Middle Ages (London: Luzac & C.O. Ltd, 1957), p. 172.

³⁰⁵ According to Watt, the reason why the Caliphs exhort scholars to master Greek sciences, especially medicine and astrology, has to do with practical reasons, i.e. to serve the medical and astrological interests of the Caliphs. See Watt, W.M., *Islamic Philosophy and Theology* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1962), p. 44.

³⁰⁶ QM, p. 5, l. 25-8.

³⁰⁷ During the last third of the 7th/13rd century, al-Dimyātī was one of the most important figures in the field of the handing down of traditions. He was born on the island of Tūnā, between Tinnīs and Damietta in 613/1217 and died in 705/1306. See Vajda, G., “Sharaf al-Dīn al-Dimyātī,” EI², II, 292; cf. al-Suyūtī, TH, p. 512.

³⁰⁸ “wa ma ‘Ihayr illā fī sukūt yafqahu wa ma ‘Isharr illā fī kalām wa manṭiq.” QM, p. 5, l. 30.

³⁰⁹ Abd al-Rahīm b. al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī b. ‘Umar b. ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Umawī al-Shayh Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad al-Asnawī was born in 704/1303 and died on Monday Jumāda II 28, 772/1371 in Egypt. See al-Suyūtī, BW, 305.

³¹⁰ “yajūz al-istinjā’ bikutub al-manṭiq wa l-falsafa li annahū lā hurmata lahā.” QM, p. 6, l. 1-2.

³¹¹ Probably this name refers to the Shafi‘ite Yūsuf b. Ibrāhīm b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Jamāl al-Adhra‘ī al-Dimashqī and al-Ḥalabī. He was appointed a *qādī* in Tīzīn where he died in 702/1303. Al-Sāḥawī, DL, X, 2.

³¹² The Shafi‘ite Walī al-Dīn Abū Zur‘a Aḥmad b. al-Ḥafiz Abu ‘l-Fadl al-‘Irāqī, who was born in 762/1362, was referred to by al-Suyūtī as *al-Imām al-‘Allāma al-Ḥafiz al-Faqīh al-Ūṣūlī*, the author of *Sharh al-Bahja*, *Muhtasar al-Muhimmāt*, *Sharh Jam‘ al-Jawāmi‘ fi Ḥ-Aslāyn*, etc. He was also a *qādī* in Egyptian provinces, who died in 826/1423. Al-Suyūtī, HM, I, 363.

³¹³ As the title suggests, this work is an extract of al-Asnawī’s *al-Muhimmāt*.

³¹⁴ *Al-Bahja* was composed by Ibn al-Wardī. This work, according to Sartain, was a versification of al-Qazwīnī’s *al-Hāwī al-Ṣagīr*. Its commentary, *Sharh al-Bahja* was written by Abu Zur‘a Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Rahīm al-Wazīr al-‘Irāqī. See Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

³¹⁵ *Aqdā’ I-Quḍāt* (the most qualified among the jurists) Zayn al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Kāfi b. ‘Alī b. Tammām al-Subkī was born in Egypt in 659/1262 and died on Tuesday, 9 Sha‘ban 735/1335. See al-Subkī, TS, X, 89.

“We cut our friendship # with those stricken by the malady of *Kitāb al-Shifā*’.

They died as the adherents of the religion of Aristotle, # while we die in the religion of the Chosen.”³¹⁶

Al-Suyūtī then records the verses in the meter *rajaz* against logic, composed by Abū Ḥabīb Jābir b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Mālaqī³¹⁷ (d. 640/1243):

Listen to the advice of a counselor who is concerned with you
If you used to heed to the advice of one who is concerned
..... with utterance derived from logic
As a matter of fact, trial is represented by logic.³¹⁸

When dealing with the biography of *al-Shayh al-Imām* Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm al-Ja‘fari in *Tabaqāt al-Sha‘rānī*, Izz al-Dīn b. Jamā‘a (d. 767/1366)³¹⁹ related what he was told by al-Qādī Diya’ al-Dīn al-Munawwī, who said: “I went to a book bazaar. I bought a book on logic. Then I put it in my sleeve. I had an idea to attend a religious lecture of *al-Shayh* Burhān al-Dīn al-Hanafī, whom I had never met before. I came to see him after having bought the book – which is in my sleeve...Then the *Sayyid*, as usual, walked through the audience advising them. He then approached and grasped my head saying: ‘We are not in need of books on logic. We are occupied with a thing other than that.’ ”³²⁰

Furthermore according to al-Suyūtī, Ibn Jamā‘a (d.767/1366) stated in his *Daw’ al-Shams fī Uṣūl al-Nafs*³²¹: “Know my brother - may God guide me and you - I am one of those who render a service to the sciences and practice them and who know those who love and hate them. So I advise you not to be occupied with

³¹⁶“qata‘na ‘l-uḥuwwa min ma‘sharīn bihim maraḍun min kitāb al-shifā’. *Famātū* ‘alā dīn sīrṭalīs wa mutnā ‘alā millat al-muṣṭafā.’ QM, p. 6, l. 5-6; This poem can also be found in SM, *op. cit.*, p.37; TS, X, 94. According to Ibn Taymiyya, this poem was actually composed by Ibn al-Qushayrī (d. 469/1077). See JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 173.

³¹⁷Probably he was *al-Qādī* Abū Ḥabīb Jābir b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Andalūsī al-Mālaqī al-Nahwī al-Adib who was born in 548/1154 and died in Ghazza in 640/1243. Al-Suyūtī, BW, p. 413.

³¹⁸“isma‘ waṣīyyata nāṣiḥ laka mushfiq#in kunta tasma‘ min waṣīyyati mushfiq ... bi lafṣat min manṭiq # inna ‘l-balā’ muwakkalun bi ‘l-manṭiq.”QM, p. 6, l. 8-12.

³¹⁹Izz al-Dīn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz hailed from a distinguished Shafi‘ite family of the Mamlūk Period, in Syria and Egypt. Al-Suyūtī regarded him as *ustādh al-zamān* (the ‘teacher of the age’) and *fāhr al-āwān al-jāmi‘ li-ashtāt al-‘ulūm* (the ‘glory of the time, expert in all sciences’). Salibi, K.S., “Ibn Djamā‘a”, EI², III, 748-9; Al-Suyūtī, BW, 25-7; TH, 531-2.

³²⁰“wa ḥakā qādī al-quḍāt ‘izz al-dīn ‘abd al-‘azīz ibn jamā‘a fī ṭabāqāt al-sha‘rānī fī tarjama al-shayh al-imām abī ishāq ibrāhīm al-ja‘fari fidhikr karāmatih qāla aḥbaranī al-qādī diya’ al-dīn al-munawwī al-muttafaq ‘alā sīdqih wa jalālatih qāla ijtaztu bisūq al-kutub fa ‘shtaraytu kitāban fī ‘l-manṭiq wa waḍa‘tuh fī kummī wa ḥatira lī simā‘ kalām al-shayh burhān al-dīn al-hanafī wa ḥudūra majlis wa ‘zih wa lam akun ra‘aytuh qabla dhālikā fā-dhahabtu ilayh ‘aqaba shirā‘ al-kitāb wa huwa fī kummīqāla fāmashā al-shayh bayn al-nās ya‘izuhum ‘alā ‘ādatih wa-jā‘a fā-waqafa ‘alā ra’sī wa-qāla mā lanā ḥājat bikitāb al-manṭiq nashtagil bigayr dhālikā.” QM, p. 6, l. 13-18.

³²¹According to al-Suyūtī, this is Ibn Jamā‘a’s autobiographical work. See al-Suyūtī, BW, 25-7; Al-Suyūtī, TH, 531-2.

rational sciences other than *uṣūl al-fiqh*, grammar and *al-ma‘āni*.³²² For philosophers, logic is the science pleasing them most. If you do not receive my request willingly, you do not turn your back, you do not occupy yourself with [any] other thing than Exegesis, Tradition and Jurisprudence. However, the fate (*al-maqdūr*) cannot be avoided and the destiny (*al-maṣṭūr*) cannot be resisted.”³²³

Logic, according to al-Suyūṭī, was also subjected to Ibn Taymiyya’s (d. 729/1329)³²⁴ criticism. Though indirect, his criticism of logic was represented by his statement, which reads: “I do not think that God will forgive al-Ma’mūn for what he has committed against his community by his introduction of the philosophical sciences among its people.”³²⁵ By referring to *Sharḥ Lāmiyat al-‘Ajām*³²⁶ of al-Ṣalāḥ al-Ṣafadī (d. 746/1345)³²⁷ al-Suyūṭī gives a reason why Ibn Taymiyya had such an attitude toward al-Ma’mūn. “It is told that al-Ma’mūn, when he had concluded a truce with a king of the island of Cyprus, wrote a letter asking from him the library of the Greeks. They were collected there in a house to which no one could enter. The king gathered his advisors and consulted them about it. All of them advised him not to supply the books to him, except for one patriarch. He said: ‘Supply the books to them, these sciences have not entered any religious state without destroying it and ensnaring its scholars.’”³²⁸ The books meant here, according to al-Suyūṭī, were those of logic, natural sciences, metaphysics, etc.³²⁹

According to al-Suyūṭī, when Ibn al-Muqrī (d. 837/1434) was asked a question posed in a verse which reads:

“What is the opposite of the negative [proposition], o ye my dear fellow [!]; or the particular [section] of them in verse (*al-nizām*) [?]”

He replied:

³²²A part of rhetoric dealing with verbal expression of concepts and content. See Rūhī al-Bā‘lbākī, *al-Mawrid, Arabic English Dictionary* (Beirut: Dār al-‘Ilm li ‘l-Malāyīnī, 1988).

³²³“i‘lam yā ahī – arshadani ‘llāh wa iyyāka – innanī mimman ḥadama al-‘ulūm wa mārasahā, wa ‘alima ḥawāḥihā wa ‘awābisahā wa anṣīḥuka bianlā tashtagila min al-‘aqliyya bigayr uṣūl al-fiqh wa ‘l-naḥw wa ‘l-ma‘āni, fa-inna ‘l-manṭiq li ‘l-falsafa ḥayru mā kānat tartādu bihi ‘l-falāsifa, walaw ‘staqbaltu min amrī mā ‘stadbaru, mā ‘shtagaltu bigayr al-tafsīr wa ‘l-hadīth wa ‘l-fiqh, walākinna al-maqdūr lā yudfa‘u wa ‘l-maṣṭūr lā yumna‘u.” QM, p. 6, l. 19-23.

³²⁴Al-Suyūṭī, TH, 516.

³²⁵“mā azunnu ‘llāh yaqfiru li ‘l-ma‘āni mā fa‘alahū ma‘a hādhīh ‘l-umma min idhāl al-‘ulūm al-falsafīyya bayn ahlihā.” QM, p. 6, l. 24-5; this story was also dealt with elaborately by al-Suyūṭī in his SM, *op. cit.*, p. 41-2.

³²⁶The complete title of his book is *al-Gayth al-Musajjām fī Sharḥ Lāmiyat al-‘Ajām*. The book is a commentary on *Lāmiyat al-‘Ajām* of Mu‘ayyid al-Dīn Ismā‘il b. al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Ali Faḥr al-Kitān, al-‘Amid al-Tugrā’ī who died in 513/1120. See the introduction of *al-Gayth* (Cairo: al-Maṭba‘a al-Azharīyya al-Miṣriyya, 1305/1888).

³²⁷Al-Ṣalāḥ al-Ṣafadī, Salāḥ al-Dīn Abū al-Ṣafā Ḥalil b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī the Shāfi‘ī died in 746/1345. He was the author of the celebrated *al-Wāfi bi ‘l-Wafāyat*.

³²⁸QM, p. 6, l. 25-7; This has been discussed elaborately by Van Koningsveld, in “Greek Manuscripts,” *op. cit.*, p. 345-70; This story can also be found in SM, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

³²⁹“wa hādhīhi ‘l-kutub hiya ‘l-manṭiq wa ‘l-tabi‘iy wa ‘l-ilāhiyy wa gayra dhālik.” QM, p. 6, l. 28.

"The opposite of the negative [proposition] which you asked me is [an entrance to] the prohibited knowledge.³³⁰

Al-Suyūṭī then refers to Badr al-Dīn al-Zarkashī (d.794/1392),³³¹ who stated in his work, *Sharḥ al-Minhāj*³³² in the chapter of *al-ijjāra* (leasing): "One is not allowed to get paid for teaching logic,"³³³ and to Wālī al-Dīn al-Malawī (d. 841/1438),³³⁴ who reported that the *Shayh al-‘Allāma* Shams al-Dīn al-Isbahānī (d.678/1279)³³⁵ ran courses on Islamic sciences in Damascus. When he wanted to travel, the *Shayh al-‘Allāma al-Ṣāliḥ* Zayn al-Dīn b. al-Murāḥhil (d. 738/1338)³³⁶ deputized for him. When the latter gave the course, he found that among the people there was someone who studied logic. One of the audience said to him that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ condemned logic. Ibn al-Murāḥhil said: "We should discuss this question and have a talk on it" So, one of them said: "We should discuss a thing on which no traditional account (*naql*) is found? However, this question has already been stipulated." Moreover: is it forbidden to quote the *fatwās* of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ? Ibn al-Murāḥhil replied: "This man either knows logic or not. If he knows it, he must know as well that there is no need to prohibit it. If he does not know it, this is ignorance." The audience dispersed. One of the habits of Ibn al-Murāḥhil was that when he took part in a funeral procession, he paid a visit to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's grave and invoked God. When this event happened, he went out for a funeral procession. Then he tried to pay a visit again to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's grave. But he did not know its location. [Something] happened... as a matter of a fact he was worthier of a mistake...the *Shayh* Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. [Ibn al-Murāḥhil] has attempted to do something to that effect [to find out Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's grave,][but he could not find it. He then asked God's forgiveness and [tried again] to seek Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's grave. Finally, he knew it and paid a visit to it as he used to.³³⁷

³³⁰"wa mā ‘aks al-sawālibi yā murajjā ay [al-juz’i] minhā fī [‘l-nizām];" "wa ‘aks al-sawālibi tas’alunī [fadhbāka muqaddam] al-‘ilm al-ḥarām." QM, p. 7, l. 1-5. The words in the square brackets is taken from al-Suyūṭī's discussion of this verses in his *al-Hāwī li ‘l-Fatāwā* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1993), vol. I, p. 273; In QM, the verses read as follows:

³³¹"wa mā ‘aks al-sawālibi yā murajjā ay al-janūbī minhā fī ‘ntizām;" "wa ‘aks al-sawālibi tas’alunī fa-tilka... al-‘ilm al-ḥarām."

³³²Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Bahādir al-Zarkashī was born in 745/1345. Al-Suyūṭī, HM, I, 437.

³³³*Sharḥ al-Minhāj* here is a work of Badr al-Dīn al-Zarkashī who gave a commentary of *Minhāj al-Tālibīn* by al-Nawawī. In his autobiographical work, al-Suyūṭī also mentions another *Sharḥ al-Minhāj* which is a work of al-Damīrī, for which al-Suyūṭī wrote a supercommentary, entitled *Hādī al-Muhtāj*. See al-Suyūṭī, *al-Tahadduth, op. cit.*, p. 136.

³³⁴"lā yajūz al-isti’jār li tadrīs al-maṇṭiq."QM, p. 7, l. 6.

³³⁵Probably he was Abū Bakr b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Ayyūb b. Aḥmad al-Malawī al-Shādhilī who was born in 762/1361 and died in Egypt in 841/1438. Al-Suyūṭī, HM, I, 529.

³³⁶The Shafī‘ite Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd b. ‘Abd al-Kāfi was born in Isfahān in 616/1220. He excelled in *uṣūl al-fiqh* and was well-versed in grammar and *belles-lettres*, but had little knowledge of *fiqh* and Tradition. He was appointed as a judge of Manbaj and became a lecturer in Egypt. He was the author of *Sharḥ al-Maḥṣūl, al-Fawā’id fī ‘l-Aslayn al-Hilāf wa ‘l-Manṭiq*, etc. He died in Cairo on 20 Rajab 678/1279. See al-Suyūṭī, BW, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

³³⁷Zayn al-Dīn b. al-Murāḥhil Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar, according to al-Ṣafadī, was specialized in *fiqh* and its *uṣūl*. He became vice Chief Judge assisting ‘Alam al-Dīn al-Āḥnā’ī in Damascus. See al-Ṣafadī, WW, VII, 374-5.

³³⁸“haka ‘l-shayh al-‘allāma al-ṣāliḥ walīy al-dīn al-malawī anna al-shayh al-‘allāma shams al-dīn al-īsbahānī kanat lahū durūs bi dimashq fasāfara wa ‘stanāba al-shayh al-‘allāma al-

Al-Suyūṭī found in a *majmū‘* in the possession of Taqī al-Dīn al-Shumunni (d.872/1468),³³⁸ without knowing who had composed it, a chapter on the reprobation of those occupied with logic. According to al-Suyūṭī, it also stated that “what is prohibited to them is the study of *‘ilm al-fuḍūl* (“the science of superfluous matters”), their being occupied with reason, their being removed from Tradition and their adherence to Logic.”³³⁹

Al-Suyūṭī incorporated the celebrated debate between Abū Sa‘īd al-Sīrāfī who was born at Sīrāf ca. 289/902 and died in Bagdad on Rajab 2, 368/ Febr. 3, 979³⁴⁰ and Mattā b. Yūnus (d. 328/940). He abridged this debate from *Mu‘jam al-Udabā’* by Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī (d. 624/1229).³⁴¹ The abridgement occupies one fourth of QM. This debate is also incorporated by al-Suyūṭī in his SM.³⁴²

According to Mahdi, the Nestorian Christian Abū Bishr Mattā, the defender of logic, was a famous translator and one of the acknowledged masters of the new philosophic school that centered on the study of, and commentary on, the Aristotelian corpus. Mahdi maintains that “the new tradition gave an important place to Aristotle’s *Organon* in the program of philosophic studies, translated those parts of it that had not already been translated and placed special emphasis on the importance of the scientific method.” This was caused by the significant role, Mahdi goes on asserting, which philosophical sciences, especially logic, came to play in the thinking and teaching of the members.³⁴³ Abū Sa‘īd al-Sīrāfī, on the other hand, was a much younger dialectical theologian, jurist and philologist who

ṣāliḥ zayn al-dīn ibn al-murāḥḥil falammā ḥadara wa kāna fī ‘l-jamā‘a man yaqra’ fī ‘l-manṭiq qāla lahū ba‘d al-hādirin inna ‘bna ‘l-ṣalāḥ yaḥiṭtu ‘alayhī faqāla ‘bnu ‘l-murāḥḥil nabḥathu fī hādhīhi ‘l-mas’ala wa natakallamu fīhā fa-qāla al-qā’il innā nabḥathu fīmā laysa fīhi naqlun wa hādhīhi ‘l-mas’ala qad nuṣṣa ‘alayhā thumma aḥzara ‘l-naql min fatāwā ‘bni ‘l-ṣalāḥ fa-qāla ibn al-murāḥḥil: hādhā lā yahlu imma an yakūna ya‘rifū ‘l-manṭiq lā fa-in kāna ya‘rifuhū fa-laysa fīhī mā yaqtādī al-hāṭ wa-in lam yakun ya‘rifuhū fa-hādhā wa-kāna min ‘ādat ibn al-murāḥḥil idha shayya‘a janāzā zāra qabr ibn al-ṣalāḥ wa-da‘ā ‘indahū falammā ttafaqat hādhīhi ‘l-wāqi‘a haraja fī ba‘dī ‘l-janā‘iz thumma... al-qabr falam ya‘rif makānahū wa aqāma ‘alā dhālikā waqtan wahuwa yatafakkaru mā ya‘rifū mawdī‘ahū wa waqa‘... fī... hādhā ‘l-qawl... wa annahū aḥaqqu bi ‘l-hāṭ... al-shayh ibn al-ṣalāḥ qad ḥāwala fī dhālikā mā‘nā lam yaṭṭali‘ ‘alayhī wa ‘stagfara ‘llāh wa dhahaba ila ‘l-qabr fa‘arafahū wa zārahū ka ‘l-‘āda. This story indicates how Ibn Murāḥḥil then regretted to have had a favourable opinion on logic. His repentance was embodied by his visit to the grave of Ibn Salāḥ, who condemned logic. QM, p. 7, l. 7-16.

³³⁸Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Hasan b. ‘Alī b. Yahyā b. Muḥammad b. Ḥalaf Allāh b. Ḥalifa, the Imām Taqī al-Dīn al-Shumunni, who was born in Alexandria in Ramadān 801/1399 and died in 872/1468, was one of al-Suyūṭī’s teachers. Al-Suyūṭī, BW, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

³³⁹“wa ra‘aytu fī majmū‘ ‘inda shayhina ‘l-imām taqī al-dīn al-shumunni a‘azzahu ‘llāh ta‘ālā mā naṣṣahū wa lam a‘rif qā‘ilahū faṣlūn fī dhammi ‘l-muṣtagilīn bī ‘l-manṭiq wa inna min al-amr al-munkar ‘alayhim wa ‘l-munkar al-ma‘lūf ladayhim tadārasuhum li ‘ilm al-fuḍūl wa tashāguluhum bī ‘l-ma‘qūl ‘an al-manqūl fī ikbābihim ‘alā ‘ilm al-manṭiq...” QM, p. 7, l. 18-9.

³⁴⁰Humbert, G., “al-Sīrāfī,” EI², IX, 668-9.

³⁴¹The text of this debate can be read in SM, *op. cit.*, p. 243-255; See QM, p. 8, l. 3 – 12, l. 6.

³⁴²SM, *op. cit.*, 243-255.

³⁴³See Muhsin Mahdi, “Language and Logic in Classical Islam” in *Logic in Classical Islamic Culture*, ed. G.E. von Grunebaum, (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1970), p. 51-83.

had studied in that city and gained high repute as an expert in philology and the religious sciences.³⁴⁴

According to Margoliouth, this debate is reported at length by Yāqūt in his *Mu‘jam al-Udabā’*, on the authority of Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawhīdī. This debate took place in the Salon of the Vizier Abū al-Faṭḥ in 320/932 in Baghdad.³⁴⁵ Some of the audience were recorded to have attended that debate: Abu ‘l-Faṭḥ b. al-Furāt, al-Marzūbānī, Ibn al-Iḥshīd, al-Ḥālidī, Abū ‘Amr Qudāma b. Ja‘far, ‘Alī b. ‘Isā b. al-Jarrāḥ, Ibn Ka‘b al-Anṣārī, al-Kindī (Abū ‘Umar Muḥammad b. Yūsuf), Ibn Abī Bishr, Ibn Rubāḥ, al-Zuhrī, Abū Firās, Ibn Rāshīd, Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Hāshimī and Ibn Yahyā al-‘Alawī.³⁴⁶

This debate was started by al-Sīrafī’s question to Mattā about the meaning of Logic. The latter answered that “Logic is an instrument whereby sound speech is known from unsound, and wrong sense from right: Like a balance, for thereby I know overweight from underweight, and what rises from what sinks”.³⁴⁷ Rejecting the idea that logic can distinguish one sound thing from another, al-Sīrafī stated “Say, you know the overweight from the underweight by the balance, whence are you to know whether what is weighed is iron, gold, copper, or lead? I find that you, after having learnt the weight, are still in need to know the substance of what is weighed, its value, and a number of other qualities which take too long to be enumerated here. This being so, the weight on which you insist, and which you are so anxious to know precisely, will benefit you only a little, and on one point only, whereas many other points remain. Moreover, a point here has escaped you. Not everything in the world admits of being weighed. For some things dry measure is employed, for others lineal measure, for others surface measure, for others rough estimate. And if this be so; with visible bodies, it is also the case with noumena that are the product of reasoning; for the senses are the shadow of intelligences, which they imitate, sometimes at a distance, sometimes nearer, retaining all the time their resemblance and similarity. But forget it! If Logic be the inventions of a Greek made in the Greek language and according to the descriptions and symbols which should attend to it, and make it umpire to decide for them or against them, and judge between them... so that they must accept what it attests and repudiate what it disapproves.”³⁴⁸

³⁴⁴Ibidem.

³⁴⁵ According to Mahdi, the text of the debate is preserved in Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawhīdī’s *al-Imtā wa ‘l-Mu‘ānasa*, ed. Aḥmad Amīn and Aḥmad al-Zayn (Cairo: Lajnat al-Ta’lif, 1953), p. 107-128. Compare with D.S. Margoliouth, “The Discussion between Abū Bishr Mattā and Abū Sa‘id al-Sīrafī on the Merits of Logic and Grammar”, in JRAS (1905), p. 79-129.

³⁴⁶QM, p. 8, l. 5-6. Margoliouth only listed some of the persons who were listed by Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawhīdī, who considered them to have attended that debate for sure. They are: al-Ḥālidī (Ja‘far b. Muḥammad b. Nāṣir), Ibn al-Iḥshīd (Abū Bakr Aḥmad), Ibn Ru‘ba, Ibn Ka‘b al-Anṣārī, Abū ‘Amr Müsa, Qudāma b. Ja‘far, ‘Alī b. ‘Isā b. Dāwūd, al-Jarrāḥ and al-Marzūbānī. Margoliouth adds two persons considered by him as those who might have attended that debate: ‘Alī b. ‘Isā al-Rummānī, Abū Ḥayyān’s teacher and Abū ‘Alī al-Fasawī. According to him, slight historic doubts exist about to Ibn Tughj and Qudāma b. Ja‘far; while serious anachronism is to be found in the mentioning of the following persons: Al-Kindī, Ibn Abī Bishr, al-Zuhrī, Ibn Rāshīd, Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, al-Hāshimī, Ibn Yahyā al-‘Alawī, Abū Firās and Ṣāhib b. Samān. See D.S. Margoliouth, ibidem.

³⁴⁷ QM, p. 8, l. 12-13.

³⁴⁸QM, p. 8, l. 14-25. For this translation, I rely fully on Margoliouth’s translation, ibidem.

Al-Suyūṭī finally cites the (legal) opinions of his teachers Sharaf al-Dīn al-Munāwī (d. 757/1354)³⁴⁹ who said that being occupied with logic is prohibited,³⁵⁰ and ‘Alam al-Dīn al-Bulqīnī (d. 868/1461),³⁵¹ whom al-Suyūṭī asked to write a work in which he prohibited logic. Then the people gathered around him and asked him not to write the work against it. Keeping his dignity (*jāh*), al-Bulqīnī did not write his prohibition of the study of logic.³⁵² Al-Suyūṭī’s narration of al-Bulqīnī’s prohibition of the study of logic can also be found in *Kitāb Bahjat al-‘Ābidīn bi Tarjamat Ḥāfiẓ al-‘Aṣr Jalāl al-Dīn* by al-Shādhilī, who quoted al-Suyūṭī as having said: “...Generally speaking, I think little of logic. Then I came across the statements by leading scholars censuring it and a *fatwā* of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ against it. In sum, I became averse to it completely. Therefore, I wrote a quire [of a work] which I entitled *al-Gayth al-Mugriq fī Tahrīm al-Manṭiq*. One of our *Shayh* al-Bulqīnī’s students wrote it out, and it went round the town. A clamour arose and much wrath was kindled. So I asked our *Shayh* al-Bulqīnī, ‘What is your opinion about logic?’ He said, ‘It is forbidden by God (*harām*)’ and he withdrew from what he had said.”³⁵³

The arguments against logic by two Shafī’ite scholars, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, son of al-Sayyid ‘Afīf al-Dīn al-Makkī (d. 855/1452)³⁵⁴ and Kamāl al-Dīn b. Imām al-Kāmilī (d. 874/1470),³⁵⁵ were also recorded in QM. Their censure can be seen, according to al-Suyūṭī, in the facts that ‘Alā’ al-Dīn had composed verses in which the latter condemned the study of logic,³⁵⁶ and that Kamāl al-Dīn always avoided

³⁴⁹ His biography can be read in al-Suyūṭī’s BW, *op. cit.*, 259; Ibn Hajar, DK, I, 17.

³⁵⁰ ... *falladhi na taqiduhū wa najzimu bihī anna l-ishtigāl bihī harām*.” QM, p. 12, l. 9-10.

³⁵¹ Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

³⁵² *wa sa’altu anhu shayḥanā qādi l-quḍāt ‘alam al-dīn al-bulqīnī fa-bādara biqawlihī harāmun wa sa’aluhū an yaktuba ḥaṭṭahū bidhālikā fa ‘jtama’ā ‘alayhi l-‘āmma wa sa’aluhū an lā yaktuba wa kāna yurā’i l-jāh falam yaktub ma’ā baqā’ihī ‘ala l-qawl bitahrīmihī ... ‘alayhim idh shara’ū fi l-ḥaṭṭ ‘allayya bisababi ḥaṭṭī ‘alayhī wa ja’ala yuthnī ‘alayya gaybatan wa ḥuḍūra*. QM, p. 12, l. 13-5.

³⁵³ ... *fa zdaraytu al-mantiq jumlatan thumma waqaftu ‘alā kalām al-‘ulama’ fī dhammihī wa mā astā bihī ibn al-ṣalāḥ familtu ‘an al-mantiq kulla l-mayl fa allāftu kurrāsatān al-gayth al-mugriq fī tahrīm al-mantiq...* MS, Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, fol. 11b; cf. an appendix in *al-Tahadduth*, *op. cit.* 241. I have also consulted the translation of the text by Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

³⁵⁴ I failed to find ‘Alā’ al-Dīn’s biographical information. However, based on that of his father, his wife and his disciples, his biographical information can be described as follows: He was a son of al-Sayyid ‘Afīf al-Dīn al-Makkī who was born in 790/1389 and died in 855/1452 (Al-Suyūṭī, NU, 162-3). He married a daughter of his uncle, Ḥabibat Allāh b. al-Ṣafī ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh Umm al-Faḍl Ibniyat al-Sayyid al-Husaynī al-Ījī who died in 895/1490 (al-Saḥawī, DL, XII, 19). Among his disciples were Jibril al-Kurdī, who died in 930/1524 (al-Gazzī, KWS, I, 172), Abū Bakr al-Ḥabīshī, who died in 930/1524 (al-Gazzī, KWS, I, 113) and ‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Maqdisī (al-Gazzī, KWS, II, 191).

³⁵⁵ Kamāl al-Dīn, who was born in 808/1406, studied under a number of scholars, among whom were Waliy al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī, al-Wāsiṭī, Ibn al-Jazarī, Shams al-Dīn al-Barmawī, Sharaf al-Dīn al-Subkī, etc. He was the author of a number of works, among which *Muḥtaṣar Tafsīr al-Bayḍāwī*, *Sharḥ Muḥtaṣar Ibn al-Ḥajīb*, *Sharḥ al-Waraqāt*. He died in Egypt in 874/1470. Al-Suyūṭī, NU, 163; According to Sartain, Kamāl al-Dīn was the one who gave al-Suyūṭī an *ijāza* to bestow the *hirqa* on whomever he wished. Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

³⁵⁶ *nazamtu fi l-ḥaṭṭ ‘alayh abyātan lā tāḥduruni l-ān*.” QM, p. 12, l. 16-7.

studying and teaching logic. When teaching the *Muhtaṣar* by Ibn al-Hājib³⁵⁷ to his disciples, he avoided reading its introduction.³⁵⁸ Al-Suyūṭī also reports the attitude toward logic of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn’s uncle, Ṣafī al-Dīn b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Ījī. According to al-Suyūṭī, al-Ījī repeatedly condemned logic and withdrew himself from its study.³⁵⁹

When attending the lesson of al-Shumunnī, al-Suyūṭī quoted the former as having said that Abu ’l-‘Abbās Ahmad b. Yūsuf al-Tuwaynī had told us...if your words are as follows: “Medicine is also a part of the sciences of the ancients, so what is your aim of saying that studying it is a social obligation?” I replied: “Medicine is not an invention of the ancients. It is rather a science which God has revealed to some prophets... Learning logic is superfluous. Learning medicine is, in contrast, exhorted, useful and a social obligation.”³⁶⁰

According to al-Suyūṭī, Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 771/1370)³⁶¹ stated that the study of logic might be allowed on the condition that one first mastered the religious sciences and that one had reached a reputation as a *fāqīh* or *muftī*.³⁶² According to Goldziher, al-Subkī, however, stated that for those who are less schooled in the religious sciences, the study of logic must be declared prohibited (*ḥaram*).³⁶³ This opinion was also held by Ibn al-Muqrī (d. 837/1434).³⁶⁴ However, the prohibition of logic is declared, al-Suyūṭī says, not only to those who are immersed in it, but also to those who are occupied by a minute part of it. The rationale behind this argument, according to al-Suyūṭī, can be traced to common

³⁵⁷ According to Vadet, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū ‘Amr ‘Uthmān b. ‘Umar b. Abī Bakr b. ‘l-Hājib was born in Asnā, a village in Upper Egypt, after 570/1174-5. His reputation is founded on his being a Mālikite jurist and a grammarian. His fame was contributed by his two works, *al-Shāfiya* (for *ṣarf*, morphology) and *al-Kāfiya* (for *nāhwa*, syntax). His *Muhtaṣar al-Muntahā fi l-Uṣūl* was an extract from *Muntahā al-Suāl wa l-Amal fi l-Ilmay al-Uṣūl wa l-Jadal*, a treatise on the sources of law according to the Mālikite school. See Vadet, J.C., “Ibn ‘l-Hādjib,” EI², III, 781-2.

³⁵⁸ “...yanfiru ‘anh, wa idhā qara’a muhtaṣar ibn al-hājib yamtani ‘u min iqrā’ muqaddimatihih.” See QM, p. 12, l. 19.

³⁵⁹ “qāla wa kāna ‘ammī al-sayyid al-ṣāliḥ al-‘ārif bi ‘llāh ṣafī al-dīn ibn ‘abd al-rahmān al-ījī yukthiru mina l-ḥaṭṭ ‘alayhī wa l-tanfīr ‘anhu.” QM, p. 12, l. 17-8.

³⁶⁰ “fa-in quulta al-ṭibb ayḍan min ‘ulūm al-awā’il famā bālukum quultum annahū min fard kifāya...quulta al-ṭibb laysa min waḍ‘ al-awā’il bal huwa ‘ilm awḥāhu ‘llāh ta‘āla ilā ba‘di l-anbiyā’...wa ayḍan fa innahū naṭu maḥḍ lā yajurru ilā ḥararin bi hīlāf al-mantiq.” QM, p. 13, l. 14-17.

³⁶¹ The author of the celebrated *Tabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyya*, Abū Nasr ‘Abd al-Wahhāb b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Kāfi Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī was born in Damascus in 727/1327 and died on 7 Dhu ‘l-Hijja 771/ 3 July 1370. GAL, II, 108-110.

³⁶² QM, p. 13, l. 20-3; According to Goldziher, al-Subkī had softened his prohibition against the study of logic in deference of authorities like al-Gazālī, whom he defended against Ibn al-Salāḥ. Goldziher, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

³⁶³ Goldziher, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

³⁶⁴ According to al-Suyūṭī, Ismā‘il b. Abī Bakr b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Yamanī al-Ḥusaynī al-Imām Sharaf al-Dīn b. al-Muqrī, born in 765/1364, was a savant of Yemenite countries (‘ālim al-bilād al-yamaniyya) and the author of *‘Unwān al-Sharaf*, by which al-Suyūṭī was inspired to compose his *al-Nafha al-Miskiyā wa l-Munha al-Makkiyya*. Ibn al-Muqrī was a disciple of the *Faqīh* Jamāl al-Dīn al-Raymī and the Grammarians, Muḥammad b. Zakariyyā and ‘Abd al-Laṭīf al-Sharajī. See al-Suyūṭī, BW, 193-4.

convention, which says that if any prohibition is declared to a big portion of something, this also holds true for a little portion of it.³⁶⁵

When concluding his discussion of the arguments against logic, al-Suyūtī interestingly refers to *al-Rawḍa*³⁶⁶ of al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277), who said that one is not allowed to issue *fatwās* when one is not well-versed in *fiqh*. Such a person is rather exhorted to ask for a *fatwā*, when something happens to him.³⁶⁷ In reality, he thereby wanted to warn people not to develop a (legal) opinion exhorting the study of logic if their authority in Islamic sciences was not reliable. Rather, they should follow what has been prescribed by leading authorities, viz. that the study of logic is prohibited, as enumarated in his QM.

Furthermore, al-Suyūtī asks the readers: “What is your opinion on someone who starts with studying logic or the like, and with studying *al-ma’ānī* and *al-bayān*? Will you oppose those leading scholars, the pillars of Islam, the guides of mankind, the scholars of the laws, and the guardians of the Sunna of the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace.” Al-Suyūtī continues his discussion of his predecessors’ statement against logic by saying: “It has been mentioned before that all the leading scholars have prohibited logic. Not one of them even pretends to master it.”³⁶⁸

Al-Suyūtī then complains that most of his contemporaries were occupied by the study of logic. They gave priority to it over the sciences of the *shari‘a*.³⁶⁹

(C) Legal cases which can be relied on for the prohibition of logic

Al-Suyūtī then enumerates thirty-five rules of jurisprudence censuring logic and the individuals occupied with it. In discussing these propositions, he sometimes refers to other scholars and reports their ideas, but sometimes expresses them independently: (1) Referring to *al-Muhimmāt* by al-Asnawī (d.772/1370) and *al-Tanbihāt* (probably by Ibn al-Ṣadr al-Balbīsī, d. 904/1499),³⁷⁰ al-Suyūtī says that

³⁶⁵“*fa-in qulta la ‘alla al-taḥrīm maḥṣūṣ bi ‘I-tawaggul fīhi dūna ‘I-ishtigāl bi ‘I-yasīr minhu, qulty lā yaṣīḥhu li ’amrayn aḥadūhumā anna ‘I-qadr al-jā’iz ‘alā hādhā gayru maqbūt al-thānī anna mā ḥurrīma kathiruhū ḥurrīma qalīluhū ḥasman li ‘I-bāb wa-lī-allā yajurra ilā ‘I-tawaggul fīhi wa līhādhā ḥurrīma qalīl ‘I-muskir wa in lam yuskir li ’anna jīnsahū muskir...”QM, p. 13, l. 24-6.*

³⁶⁶This work was published under the title, *Rawḍat al-Tālibīn* (Damascus: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1966), 9 juzs.

³⁶⁷“... fī usūl al-fiqh alladhī lam yabra‘ fī ‘I-fiqh lā yaḥillu lahu ‘I-iftā’ wa yalzimuhū al-istiṭfā’ idhā waqā‘at lahū hādhīta.”QM, p. 14, l. 1-2.

³⁶⁸“wa qad sabaqa fī kalām man naqalnā ‘anhu... al-taṣrīḥ bi anna akābira ... kānū yamna‘ūna minhu ḥattā lam yakun aḥadun yajsiru ‘ala ‘I-tazāḥur bihī...”QM, p. 14, l. 3-4.

³⁶⁹“wa inkāna ahl al-‘aṣr al-yawm ja‘alūh...darasahum laylan wanahāran, waqaddamūh ‘alā ‘ulūm al-shāfi‘.” QM, p. 14, l. 5-6.

³⁷⁰I was confronted with two *al-Tanbihāt*: first, *al-Tanbihāt al-Muḥammala ‘ala ‘I-Mawādi‘ al-Muṣhkila* by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Ḥalil b. Kaykaldī b. ‘Abd Allāh al-‘Alā’ī al-Dimashqī al-Shāfi‘ī (d. 761/1359, GAL, S. II, 68) and second, *al-Tanbihāt ila ‘I-Taḥqīqāt*, a summary of Imām al-Ḥaramayn’s *al-Waraqāt*, by Cairene Shafī‘ite ‘Umar b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Muṣṭafā al-Sirāj b. al-Shihāb b. al-Shams b. al-Ṣadr al-Balbīsī who died in 904/1499. I confined myself to the latter since he was closely affiliated to the “al-Nawawī circle,” for which he composed *Sharḥ al-Arba‘in al-Nawawīyya* (al-Sāḥawī, DL, VI, 72). By the “al-Nawawī circle,” I refer here to those scholars whose works were

making use of books on logic during *istinja'* is justified.³⁷¹ (2) He who sees one occupied with logic, is requested to undertake *sujūd al-shukr*, at the occasion of which he is advised to say: "Praise be to God who granted me safety from what He has afflicted upon you," and to ask the latter for repentance.³⁷² (3) Praying behind one occupied with logic is reprehended.³⁷³ (4) Being occupied with logic is a violation of the *shari'a*.³⁷⁴ (5) The fasting of one who is occupied with logic does not necessitate any Divine reward.³⁷⁵ (6) One who reads a book of logic during seclusion in the mosque (*i'tikāf*), commits an abominable act.³⁷⁶

Referring to *Sharḥ al-Muḥadhdhab*³⁷⁷ by al-Nawawī and *Sharḥ al-Minhāj* by al-Asnawī, al-Suyūṭī says (7) that selling a book of logic is not allowed.³⁷⁸ (8) If one buys a book of logic and that of any science other than logic at the same time, the transaction for the book of logic is illegal, but the transaction of the book of any science other than logic is valid.³⁷⁹ (9) Whoever buys a book which is well-known as dealing with logic, such as *al-Muḥtaṣar* (by Ibn al-Ḥājib), thinking that, [it is not] ... there is no doubt that he has no choice [to return the book and ask the proceeds thereof back,] because [such a book] deserves obliteration.³⁸⁰ (10) The proceeds gained from selling a book on logic are like the proceeds gained from selling alcoholic beverages or a dog.³⁸¹ (11) Referring to *al-Rawḍa* and *Sharḥ al-Muḥadhdhab* by al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277), al-Suyūṭī remarks that one is obliged to destroy them by means of burning, washing, etc.³⁸² (12) If one destroys books on logic, one is told not only to destroy their covers, but to destroy them completely.³⁸³

commentaries, super commentaries, compendiums, etc of al-Nawawi's works. These works were most frequently referred to by al-Suyūṭī in his QM.

³⁷¹"yajūzu 'l-istiņā' bikutubihī..."QM, p. 16, l. 5-7.

³⁷²"man ra'a muṣtagilan bihī sunna lahū sujūd al-shukr wa yuẓhiruhū la'allaḥū yatūbu wa yaqūlu al-ḥamdu li ʻllāh alladhi 'afānī mimma 'ibtalāka."QM, p. 16, l. 7-8.

³⁷³"tukrahu Ṭ-ṣalāt ḥalfahū, fain kāna lā ya'rifu aḥkāmahā ayḍan... min sunanihā fa-wādiḥ annahū lā taṣīḥḥ šalātuḥū wa lā 'l-iqtidā' bihī."QM, p. 16, l. 8-9.

³⁷⁴"... al-ma'shiyya falaysa lahū... wa lā jam' wa lā tasquṭ 'inda... wa lā 'l-fard... al-tayammum wa lā yatanaffal 'ala al-rahīla wa lā yaṣīḥḥu 'ala... ya'kul al-maytata idhā 'dūrra mā lam yatub kamā idhā sāfara li 'l-zinā... aw aḥadha 'l-muskir aw naḥwa dhālikā."QM, p. 16, l. 10-12.

³⁷⁵"... wahuwa ṣā'im faka 'l-gayba aw aḥash fayaṣīḥḥu ṣawmuhū wa yafūtuhū ajru 'l-ṣā'im al-tāmm..."QM, p. 16, l. 12-14.

³⁷⁶"idhā aqra'ahū wa huwa mu'takif faqad aḥasha..."QM, p. 16, l. 14-5.

³⁷⁷*Al-Majmū'* *Sharḥ al-Muḥadhdhab* has been published twice: first, in Madīna by al-Maktaba al-Salafiyya (1344/1925); second in Damascus by Dār al-Qalam (1992-1996) 20 vols., ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-Zuḥaylī.

³⁷⁸"la yajūzu bay' kutubihī..."QM, p. 16, l. 15-21.

³⁷⁹"mani 'ṣhtarā kutuba 'ilm wa manṭiq ṣafqatan wāḥidatan baṭula al-bay' fi 'l-manṭiq wa saḥħa fi gayrīhī..."QM, p. 16, l. 21-3.

³⁸⁰"mani 'ṣtarā kitāban fi 'l-manṭiq mumayyaz[an] ka 'l-muḥtaṣar ẓānnan annahū... lā shakka annahū lā hīyār lahū li annahū mustaḥiqqu 'l-izāla."QM, p. 16, l. 24-5.

³⁸¹"law aqarrā līlūlān bā'i'an min thaman kutub manṭiq... law qāla min thaman ḥamrin aw kalbīn..."QM, p. 16, l. 25-26.

³⁸²"yajibu 'alā kulli aḥad itlāfuhā bimā yaqdīru 'alayhī min ḥarq wa gusl wa gayrīhī..."QM, p. 16, l. 26-9.

³⁸³"idhā atlafahā falaysa lahū an yatlīfa jildahū bal yaṭsiluhū minhū illā an lā yata'attā itlāfuhū limān 'ṣāḥibihī yatlīfuhū kayfā tayassara ka-inā' al-ḥamr."QM, p. 16, l. 29-30.

(13) Basing himself on *Sharḥ al-Minhāj* by al-Zarkashī, al-Suyūṭī remarks that one is not allowed to ask for a salary for teaching logic,³⁸⁴ (14) that paying one who copied a book of logic is not justified,³⁸⁵ (15) a copyist deserves his salary only if he leaves out passages well identified as containing logical discussion.³⁸⁶ (16) According to the *Shayḥ Walī al-Dīn Abū Zur‘a Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Rahīm al-Wazīr al-‘Irāqī* in his *Muḥtaṣar al-Ummahāt* [probably: *al-Muhibbāt*], giving books on logic as *waqf* is not allowed.³⁸⁷

Based on *al-Sharḥ al-Sagīr*³⁸⁸ (probably by al-Rāfi‘ī, d. 623/1226),³⁸⁹ al-Suyūṭī also notes (17) that giving *waqf* to one who is occupied with logic is not allowed;³⁹⁰ (18) that the religious endowment (*al-waqf*) cannot be distributed to one who is knowledgeable of logic;³⁹¹ (19-21) “the status of the will (*waṣīyya*) [a] dealing with books of logic and [b] being declared to those who are occupied with it, as well as [c] to its scholars, is like that of the religious endowment (*waqf*) as mentioned before,”³⁹² (22) that one fifth of the booty is not to be endowed to one occupied with logic;³⁹³ (23) that alms are not to be given to him, who is occupied with logic, while he is still able to earn his daily expenses;³⁹⁴ (24) that one who is occupied with logic has no authority to marry one who is under his authority;³⁹⁵ (25) that the marriage does not become concluded due to one who is occupied with logic.³⁹⁶ (26) ...;³⁹⁷ (27) and that one is required to pay a dower and food

Some scholars have discussed this topic specifically: J. Sadan, “Genizah...,” in BO, op. cit., esp. p.52-3, and Van Koningsveld, “Greek Manuscripts,” *op. cit.*, p. 351.

³⁸⁴“lā yajūz al-istiṭār li tadrīshī.”QM, p. 16 (l. 30) - 17 (l. 1).

³⁸⁵“ista’jara [warrāqan] liyaktuba lahū lam yaṣīḥh al-iṭāra fa’iñ katabahū ‘aṣā wa ‘uzira wa lā ujrata lahū.”QM, p. 17, l. 1-2.

³⁸⁶“ista’jara warrāqan liyaktuba kitāban fīhi mantiq mumayyaz[an] fa asqataḥū – wa qad ahsana – wa lahū al-qisṭ min al-musa “ar wa yabṭulu mā...”QM, p. 17, l. 2-3.

³⁸⁷“lā yaṣīḥhū waqf kutubihī.”QM, p. 17, l. 3-4.

³⁸⁸Some parts of *al-Sharḥ al-Sagīr* have been edited and studied by (1) Ma’mūn Ṣalīḥ Muhammad al-Sākit, *Taḥqīq wa Dirāsa Kitāb al-Sharḥ al-Sagīr ‘alā Kitāb al-Wajīz min Awwal Kitāb al-Salāḥiyyat al-Awwal Salāt al-Taṭawwu*’ (M.A. Thesis at the University of al-Jinān); and by (2) ‘Abd al-Qādir Aḥmad Yūsuf al-‘Umari, *al-Sharḥ al-Sagīr ‘ala ‘l-Wajīz li ‘l-Gazālī li ‘l-Imām Abi ‘l-Qāsim ‘Abd al-Karīm ibn Muḥammad al-Rāfi‘ī min Salāt al-‘Idān ilā Āḥir Kitāb al-Zakāh (dirāsa wa taḥqīq)* (M.A. Thesis at the University of al-Jinān).

³⁸⁹Although al-Suyūṭī does not mention the author of *al-Sharḥ al-Sagīr*, I confirm myself that this work was composed by the Shafi‘ite Abu ‘l-Qāsim Imām al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Abī Sa‘id Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Rāfi‘ī, born at Qazwīn in 555/1160 and died there in 623/1226, whose work, *Kitāb al-Muhibbāt* was a main source for al-Nawawī in the composition of his celebrated *Minhāj al-Tālibīn*. See Arioli, A, “al-Rāfi‘ī,” EI², VIII, 389.

³⁹⁰“waqf ‘alā man yashtagilu bihī lam yaṣīḥha...”QM, p. 17, l. 4-6.

³⁹¹“waqf ‘alā ... annahū lā yuṣrafū li ‘l-‘ālim bihī.”QM, p. 17, l. 6.

³⁹²“al-waṣīyya bi-kutubihī waliman yashtagilu bihī wa li ‘l-‘ulamā’ kamā dhukira fī ‘l-waqf.”QM, p. 17, l. 6-7.

³⁹³“lā yuṣrafu ilā ahlihī min ḥumus al-ganīma alladhī yuṣrafu ila ‘l-‘ulamā’?”QM, p. 17, l. 7-8.

³⁹⁴“lā yuṣrafu ilayhī min al-zakāh idhā kāna qādiran ‘ala ‘l-kasb...”QM, p. 17, l. 8-9.

³⁹⁵“lā yalī nikāh mawliyyātihī.”QM, p. 17, l. 10.

³⁹⁶“lā yan‘aqidu bihī al-nikāh.”QM, p. 17, l. 10.

³⁹⁷Lacunae. QM, p. 17, l. 11.

(*mahr wa ma’una*) to the person occupied with studying *shari‘a*, but not to one occupied with logic.³⁹⁸

(28) Based on *al-Rawda* of al-Nawawī, al-Suyūtī says that one’s marriage is not valid if the dower is in the form of teaching the Tora, the Bible, or logic.³⁹⁹

(29) Saluting one occupied with logic is disapproved.⁴⁰⁰

Based on the *Rihla*⁴⁰¹ of the Malikite Ibn Rashīd al-Sibṭī (d. 721/1322) and *Mu‘jam al-Safar* of al-Silāfi, al-Suyūtī also remarks (30) that the testimony of one occupied with logic is not reliable, unless he has repented;⁴⁰² (31) that the report of one occupied with logic is not accepted;⁴⁰³ (32) that one occupied with logic cannot be given a *wilāya*, the condition for which is ‘adāla, the authority to pass judgement (*al-qadā*);⁴⁰⁴ and (33) that everyone is required to reject and oppose one occupied with logic.⁴⁰⁵

Referring himself to the *Imām Abu ’l-Faraj* (d. 597/1201),⁴⁰⁶ and to *al-Rawdā* by al-Nawawī, al-Suyūtī maintains (34) that the hand of one who has stolen books on logic needs not be cut off;⁴⁰⁷ and that (35) a vow to study logic should not be fulfilled, because the fulfillment of it is a violation.⁴⁰⁸

(D.) Reasons why logic was prohibited

Al-Suyūtī then turns to discuss the reason why logic should be prohibited. In response to the proposition which says that logic would prevent one from a mistake when developing a viewpoint, al-Suyūtī proposes five answers: (1) That logic prevents the mind from making a mistake is totally wrong. This is reflected by the fact that leading scholars are unagreed on numerous questions. They rather

³⁹⁸ “yajibu ‘ala al-ab wa ‘l-ajdād bi‘an yankiḥahū wa yuqaddimu bimahriḥī wa mu’natihī bishart an yakūna... ‘anhu... falaw ishtagala ‘an al-kash bi-‘ilm shar‘ī fa-‘l-zāhir annahū ‘ājiz kamā dhakarahū fī... ishtagala ‘anhu bi ‘l-manṭiq fagayr ‘ājiz fā lā yu‘lā.” QM, p. 17, l. 11-13.

³⁹⁹ “asdaqahā... fasada al-ṣaddāq wa... wa fī ‘l-rāwda law nakaḥa muslimatan aw kitābiyyatan ‘alā ta‘līm al-tawrāt wa ‘l-injīl lam yaṣīḥha li annahū lā yajūz al-iṣhtigāl bihī...” QM, p. 17, l. 14-16.

⁴⁰⁰ “yukrahu ‘l-salām ‘ala al-mushtagil bihī raddan wa ‘btidā’an...” QM, p. 17, l. 17.

⁴⁰¹ *Mil’ al-‘Ayba bimā Jama‘a bi Tūl al-Gayba fi ‘l-Wijha al-Wajīha ilā ‘l-Haramayn Makka wa Tayyiba*, ed. Muḥammad al-Ḥabīb b. al-Ḥawja (Tunis: al-Shirkā al-Tūnisiyya li ‘l-Tawzī’, 1981).

⁴⁰² “lā tuqbalu shahādatuhū mā lam yatub.” QM, p. 17, l. 18.

⁴⁰³ “lā tuqbalu riwāyatuhū...” QM, p. 17, l. 18-9.

⁴⁰⁴ “lā tajūz wilāyat sharṭuhā al-‘adāla wa min dhālikā ‘l-qadā?’” QM, p. 17, l. 19-20.

⁴⁰⁵ “yajibu ‘alā kulli ahad al-inkār ‘ala ‘l-mushtagil bihī wa lā yaṣquṭu bizann annahū lā yufidu wa yata‘ayyan ‘alā man naṣaba li ‘inkār al-munkarāt wa... al-muhtasib...” QM, p. 17, l. 21-3.

⁴⁰⁶ *Al-Imām al-‘Allāma Jamāl al-Dīn Abu ‘l-Faraj ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Alī b. ‘Alī b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Qurashī al-Ḥanbālī*, whose nickname was Ibn al-Jawzī, the author of the celebrated *Talbīs Iblīs* was born ca. 510/1117 and died in 597/1201. Al-Suyūtī, TH, 477-8.

⁴⁰⁷ “idhā saraqa kutubahū... annahū lā qat‘...” QM, p. 17, l. 24-30.

⁴⁰⁸ “nadhar iqra‘ihī aw qirā‘atihī lā yan‘aqidu nadharuhū idh lā yaṣīḥhu nadharu ma‘siyyatin...” QM, p. 18, l. 1-2.

propose different opinions on one and the same issue.⁴⁰⁹ (2) If the proposition was sound, all those who undertake *ijtihād* would always come to a correct legal opinion. But this is not the case. This is based on the words of the Prophet that those who undertake *ijtihād* might make a mistake: “if a jurist makes an effort to deduce a legal opinion and makes a mistake, he deserves single recompense” (*idhā ǧtahada ʔ-l-hākim wa aḥṭa’ā fālahū ajr*)⁴¹⁰ (3) Most logicians themselves dispute against each other, whereas the truth is one and not numerous.⁴¹¹ (4) The inventors of logic among the philosophers hold, for instance, a belief in the sempiternity of the Universe and other believes which are against the creeds of the *sharī’ā*.⁴¹² (5) Based on their intellect and guided by their logic, they are of the conviction that the earth is round. This is in contrast with what God has stated in the Koran: “*wa ilā ʔ-l-ard suṣiḥat...*”⁴¹³ This verse, according to the interpreters, among whom is the *Shayh* Jalāl al-Dīn al-Mahallī (d. 864/1459),⁴¹⁴ is a refutation of the astronomers.⁴¹⁵

From his words mentioned in no. 4 above, it follows that al-Suyūṭī identifies philosophers who maintain the eternity of the world with logicians. In other words, al-Suyūṭī seems to assert that philosophers and logicians are identical.

1. 4. Conclusion: Evaluation of QM as a source for the history of the opposition to logic

In his discussion against logic, al-Suyūṭī refers either directly or indirectly to 44 scholars of various law schools, beginning with al-Shāfi’ī (d. 203/820) and ending with the Shāfi’ite Ibn al-Ṣadr al-Balbīsī (d. 904/1499), as well as to 28 works which deal either explicitly or incidentally with the opposition to logic. Nevertheless, al-Suyūṭī can be said to have limited himself in his discussion to the Sunnite

⁴⁰⁹“anna da ‘wā ‘iṣmat al-fīkr ḥaṭa’ ṣurāḥ wa qad ra’aynā ‘uzamā’ al-a’imma iḥtalafū fī ‘iddat masā’il wa aṭaba kullun minhum bīhilāf qawl al-āḥar, afatarā anna kulla min al-jawābāyān al-muhtalifāyān ka ʔ-l-hill wa ʔ-l-hurma... shay’ wāhid....” QM, p. 18, l. 2-4.

⁴¹⁰“annahū law saḥḥa dhālikā lakāna kull mujtahid muṣīban walaysa kadhālik, faqad ahbara ṣalla allāh ‘alayh wasallam bī anna min al-mujtahidīn man yuḥti’u ḥayth qāla: idha ǧtahada ʔ-l-hākim wa aḥṭa’ā fālahū ajr.” QM, p. 18, l. 4-8.

⁴¹¹“anna kathīran min ahlihī qad waqa’ā ʔ-l-iḥtilāf baynahum wa ʔ-l-haqq wāhid lā yata’addad...” QM, p. 18, l. 8-9.

⁴¹²“inna muḥtari’ihī mina ʔ-l-falāsifa qad qālū biqidam al-‘ālam wa gayrihī min al-‘aqā’id al-munābidha li ʔ-l-sharī’ā...” QM, p. 18, l. 9-11.

⁴¹³“Will they not look at the camels how they have been created; at the heaven how it has been uplifted; at the mountains how they have been set up; at the earth how it has been laid flat?” See *al-Gāshiya* (LXXXVIII): 15-18, Bell, II, 653.

⁴¹⁴He is famous for his co-authorship of the celebrated Exegesis called *Tafsīr al-Jalālayn* together with al-Suyūṭī, who was his pupil. His full name was Abū ‘Alī Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Anṣārī al-Shāfi’ī, born in Cairo 791/1389 and died there on 1 Muḥarrā 854/28 October 1459. Pellat, CH, “al-Mahallī,” EI², V, 1223; Al-Suyūṭī, HM, I, 232.

⁴¹⁵“annahum qālū bi-‘uqūlīhim wa bi-hidāyat manṭiqihim fī ʔ-l-ilm alladhi sammūhū ‘ilm al-hay’ā anna ʔ-l-ard kurra lā saṭh fa-nazala ʔ-l-qur’ān bi ḥilāfihī, qāla ta’āla (wa ilā ʔ-l-ard sutiḥat), qāla ʔ-l-mufassirūn wa minhum ‘alāmat al-muta’abbirīn al-shayh jalāl al-dīn al-mahallī fī hādhīhi ʔ-ayat radd li qawl ahl al-hay’ā anna ʔ-l-ard kurra.” QM, p. 18, l. 11-14.

scholars, most of which were of the Shafi‘ite school of law, in spite of the fact that some scholars of non-Sunnite theological affiliation had opposed logic as fervently as the Sunnite scholars. This is substantiated by the fact that al-Suyūtī in his discussion against logic does not make a single reference to, for instance, the Zaidite Ibn al-Wazīr al-Šāfi‘ī (840/1374), who had composed *Tarjih Asālib al-Qur’ān ‘alā Asālib al-Yūnān*, in which he fervently condemned Greek logic and philosophy.⁴¹⁶ Accordingly, the systematic opposition to logic by the Mu‘tazilite Ibn al-Shirshīr (d. 293/905) and the Shi‘ite thinkers, Hasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbahtī (d. ca. 310/922), the author of *al-Radd ‘ala ’l-Manṭiq* and Abū al-Najā al-Farīd, the author of *Kasr al-Manṭiq*, receive no attention from al-Suyūtī at all.

The written sources on which al-Suyūtī relies in QM can be delineated chronologically as follows:

1. *Ithāf al-Nubalā’*⁴¹⁷ by Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (d. 463/1071)
2. a. *Iḥyā’ ‘Ulūm al-Dīn*
 - b. *al-Mustasfā* by al-Gazālī (d. 505/1111)
3. *Mu‘jam al-Ṣafar* by al-Silafī (d. 576/1180)
4. *Al-Sharḥ al-Ṣagīr*⁴¹⁸ by al-Rāfi‘ī (d. 623/1226)
5. *Fatāwā* by Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1254)
6. *Al-Tawakkul fī al-Radd ilā ’l-Amr al-Awwāl*⁴¹⁹ by Abū Shāma (d. 665/1268)
7. a. *Ṭabaqāt*⁴²⁰
 - b. *Sharḥ al-Muhadhdhab*⁴²¹
 - c. *Al-Rawḍa*⁴²² by al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277)
8. *Hāshiyat Sharḥ al-Bahja* by al-Bayḍāwī (d. 716/1316)
9. *Al-Rīḥla*⁴²³ by Ibn Rashīd (d. 721/1322)
10. *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* by Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 732/1332)
11. *Al-Nuḍār* by Abū Ḥayyān al-Garnātī (d. 745/1344)
12. *Sharḥ Lāmiyat al-‘Ajām*⁴²⁴ by al-Ṣalāḥ al-Ṣafadī (d. 746/1345)
13. a. *Zagal al-‘Ilm*,⁴²⁵

⁴¹⁶ Madelung suggests that the great savant and the independent *Mujtahid* Ibn al-Wazīr al-Šāfi‘ī played a significant role in moderating the Zaydite teachings in order to render them acceptable to the Sunnites. His voluminous *al-‘Awāsim wa ’l-Qawāsim* represented his defence of the Sunnite school doctrine, criticizing the Zaydite teachings. Likewise, Ibn al-Wazīr, Madelung says, had accepted the Sunnite canonical collection of *hadīth* as authoritative on in religion. The attempt of Ibn al-Wazīr to favour the neo-Sunni school was to accommodate the religious views and sentiments of the majority of the people under the control of the Zaydite Imamate. The long lasting Zaidite rule in Yemen lasting until the modern time (1382/1962) is said to have owed much to Ibn al-Wazīr’s merit. See Madelung, W., “Zaydiyya,” EI², XI, 477-81.

⁴¹⁷ The complete title of this work, according to Brockelmann, is *Ithāf al-Nubalā’ bi aḥbār al-thuqalā’*. See GAL, G. II, 154; S. II, 192.

⁴¹⁸ This work refers to *al-Sharḥ al-Ṣagīr ‘alā ’l-Wajīz li ’l-Gazālī*. GAL, G. I, 393.

⁴¹⁹ GAL, S. I, 551.

⁴²⁰ Brockelmann refers to this work as *Ṭabaqāt al-Fuqahā’ al-Šāfi‘īyya*. GAL, G. I, 397.

⁴²¹ GAL, G. I, 397; S. I, 684.

⁴²² GAL, G. I, 396; S. I, 753, II, 286.

⁴²³ GAL, S. II, 344.

⁴²⁴ *Al-Gayth al-Musajjām fi Sharḥ Lāmiyat al-‘Ajām* is referred to by Brockelmann as *al-Gayth al-Musajjām* or *Gayth al-Adab alladhī ‘Nsajam*. GAL, S. I, 439-40.

⁴²⁵ GAL, S. II, 47.

- b. *Ta’rīh al-Islām*,⁴²⁶
- c. *Mu’jam*,⁴²⁷
- d. *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* by al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348)
- 14. *Kitāb Farā’id wa Maqāṣid al-Qawā’id*⁴²⁸ by al-Adfuwī (d. 748/1347)
- 15. a. *Naṣīḥat al-Muslim al-Mushfiq li man Ubtuliya bi Ḥubb ‘Ilm al-Manṭiq*
b. *Al-Haṭṭ ‘ala ’l-Manṭiq* by al-Qazwīnī (d. 750/1349)
- 16. *Daw’ al-Shams fī Usūl al-Nafs* by Ibn Jamā‘a (d. 767/1366)
- 17. a. *Sharḥ al-Mīnhāj*⁴²⁹
b. *Al-Muhibbāt wa ’l-Tanqīh fīmā Yuraddu ‘ala ’l-Taṣhīh*⁴³⁰ by Jamāl al-Dīn al-Asnawī (d. 772/1371)
- 18. *Sharḥ al-Mīnhāj*⁴³¹ by al-Zarkashī (d. 794/1392)
- 19. *Muhtasar al-Muhibbāt wa Nukatih*⁴³² by Walī al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī (d. 826/1423)
- 20. *Al-Tanbīhāt ilā ’l-Taḥqīqāt* by Ibn al-Ṣadr al-Balbīsī (d. 902/1499).

The indispensability of this work for an understanding of the history of the opposition to logic lies, first of all, in the fact that al-Suyūṭī makes use of works which deal exclusively with the opposition to logic, i.e. *al-Haṭṭ ‘ala ’l-Manṭiq* and *Naṣīḥat al-Muslim al-Mushfiq li man Ubtuliya bi Ḥubb ‘Ilm al-Manṭiq* (15a and 15b), which are (presumably) no longer extant. It should be stated here that modern author(s) have never referred to them. The author of GAL, Brockelmann, for instance, remains silent about these works.

Although the sources which al-Suyūṭī relies on when discussing the opposition to logic are *fiqh* book(s), its commentary and super commentary (4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13a, 14, 17a, 17b, 18, 19, 20), biographical dictionaries and/or works on history (1, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13b, 13c, and 13d), and autobiography (16), as well as works dealing with theologically-juridical and/or mystical discussion (2a and 2b), they are also, important sources for the history of the opposition to logic, since they deal with this issue as well. With the exception of *Fatāwā* by Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Iḥyā’* and *al-Mustasfā* by al-Gazālī, not a single reference to the above sources has been made by the modern authors when discussing the opposition to logic, despite the fact that some of them, such as *Sharḥ al-Muhadhdhab*, *Rawdat al-Tālibīn*, *al-Rīḥla*, *Sharḥ Lāmiyat al-‘Ajām*, etc, have been published.

Another reason why QM can be regarded as an indispensable source for the history of the opposition to logic is that al-Suyūṭī in his QM has drawn our

⁴²⁶ *Ta’rīh al-Dhahabī*, *Ta’rīh al-Islām*, ed. ‘Umar ‘Abd al-Salām Tadmurī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Arabī, 1987), 47 vols. According to ‘Awwād, this book is the greatest work of the author since it summarizes a number of historical books. Thus it became a reference of great importance for historians such as al-Ṣafadī, Ibn Shākir al-Kutubī, al-Subkī, al-Asnawī, Ibn Kathīr, Ibn Rajab, al-Fayyūmī, Ibn Daqmāq, al-Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, al-Sāḥawī, Ibn ‘Abd al-Hadī and al-Suyūṭī. See Ma‘rūf, Bashshār ‘Awwād, *al-Dhahabī wa Minhājuhū fī Kitābihī Ta’rīh al-Islām* (Cairo: Matba‘at ‘Isā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī wa Shirkāhu, 1976), p. 9-17.

⁴²⁷ GAL, G. II, 48, S. II, 47.

⁴²⁸ GAL, G. II, 31.

⁴²⁹ GAL, G. II, 91.

⁴³⁰ This probably refers to what Brockelmann lists as *al-Tanqīh*, *Hāshiya ‘alā Taṣhīh al-Tanbīh*. GAL, S. II, 107.

⁴³¹ This probably refers to what Brockelmann lists as *Tawdīh al-Mīnhāj*. GAL, G. II, 92, S. II, 108.

⁴³² GAL, S. II, 71.

attention to *al-Nuḍār* composed by Abū Ḥayyān al-Garnāṭī to report his early beginnings, his activities, his teachers and his flight from Granada. The indispensability of this work lies in the fact that it could shed light not only to the history of the opposition to logic, (because of which Abū Ḥayyān, al-Suyūṭī reports, fled from Granada), but also to the study of the history of Muslim Spain.

The indispensability of QM as a new source for the history of the opposition to logic is also reflected by the fact that in QM al-Suyūṭī draws our attention to various arguments against logic, which have not (yet) been referred to by any modern scholar. When discussing Ibn Jubayr al-Kinānī's attitude toward logic, Rescher, for instance, refers to Tritton's *Materials*, which records only four verses composed by Ibn Jubayr against logic,⁴³³ whereas al-Suyūṭī in his QM records twenty verses.

In this light, one might suggest that QM can be regarded as an important source for the history of the opposition to logic, since it provides us with rich data concerning Arabic writings dealing explicitly or incidentally with the opposition to logic.

As for the authorities whose arguments against logic are discussed in QM, they take the following order:

- (1) The Shafi‘ite al-Gazālī (d. 505/1111)
- (2) The Shafi‘ite al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277)
- (3) The Shafi‘ite Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Sahrazūrī (d. 643/1254)
- (4) The Shafi‘ite Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348)
- (5) The Malikite Abū ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-Barr (d. 463/1071)
- (6) The Shafi‘ite Taqī al-Dīn b. Daqīq al-‘Id (d. 702/1302)
- (7) The Shafi‘ite Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 744/1344)
- (8) The Shafi‘ite Kamāl al-Dīn al-Adfuwī (d. 747/1347)
- (9) The Shafi‘ite Abū Shāma al-Dimashqī (d. 665/1268)
- (10) The Ḥanafite Sirāj al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī (d. 750/1349)
- (11) The Shafi‘ite Abū Ṭāhir al-Silafī (d. 576/1180)
- (12) The Malikite Ibn Rashīd al-Sibtī (d. 721/1322)
- (13) The Malikite Abū Ḥayyān al-Garnāṭī (d. 745/1344)
- (14) The Shafi‘ite Sharaf al-Dīn al-Dimyāṭī (d. 705/1306)
- (15) The Shafi‘ite Jamāl al-Dīn al-Asnawī (d. 772/1371)
- (16) The Shafi‘ite Zayn al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Kāfi al-Subkī (d. 735/1335)
- (17) The Malikite Abū Ḥabib al-Mālaqī (d. 640/1243)
- (18) The Shafi‘ite ‘Izz al-Dīn b. Jamā‘a (d. 767/1366)
- (19) The Hanbalite Taqī al-Dīn b. Taymiyya (d. 729/1329)
- (20) The Shafi‘ite Ibn al-Muqrī (d. 837/1434)
- (21) The Shafi‘ite Badr al-Dīn al-Zarkashī (d. 794/1392)
- (22) The Mystic Wali al-Dīn al-Malawī (d. 841/1438) who discusses the attitude of Zayn al-Dīn b. al-Murāḥhil (d. 738/1338)
- (23) The Ḥanafite Abū Sa‘id al-Sirāfī (d. 368/979)
- (24) The Shafi‘ite Sharaf al-Dīn al-Munāwī (d. 757/1357)
- (25) The Shafi‘ite ‘Alam al-Dīn al-Bulqīnī (d. 868/1461)
- (26) The Shafi‘ite ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, son of ‘Afīf al-Dīn al-Makkī (d. 855/1452)

⁴³³Rescher, *op. cit.*, p. 60; Tritton, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

- (27) The Shafi'ite Kamāl al-Dīn b. Imām al-Kāmilī (d. 874/1470)
- (28) The Malikite Taqī al-Dīn al-Shumunni (d. 872/1468)
- (29) The Shafi'ite Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 771/1370)

Although the eponym of the Shafi'ite school of law, al-Shāfi‘ī, was referred to in QM as one who pronounced words against theology, he can be regarded here also as one who opposed logic, for obvious reasons. Al-Suyūtī, as can be read in SM, identifies theology with logic and *vice-versa*, because of their intricate connections.

As can be seen from the scheme above, in his discussion of logic al-Suyūtī referred to 29 scholars of various legal schools, five of whom are Malikite, two Hanafite, and one Hanbalite, while the rest are Shafi'ites. Among those scholars, there are five scholars (no: 2, 7, 9, 15, 19) whom al-Suyūtī qualifies as *mujtahids*,⁴³⁴ three (no. 1, 6 and 11) as *mujaddids* (renewers of the religion);⁴³⁵ four scholars whom he referred to as Chief Judge (*qādī al-qudāt*) (18, 24, 25, 28);⁴³⁶ one as *aqdā al-qudāt* (no. 16);⁴³⁷ one (no. 22) as mystic, while the rest are referred to by al-Suyūtī and/or by the biographers as belonging to the most knowledgeable persons of their time in *Tafsīr*, Tradition and Jurisprudence (no. 3),⁴³⁸ the “seal of the *Hāfiẓs*” (no. 4),⁴³⁹ the greatest traditionist in Al-Andalus (no. 5),⁴⁴⁰ the great *Hāfiẓ* and the traditionist of Iraq (no. 10),⁴⁴¹ a leading scholar of Yemen (no. 20),⁴⁴² etc. Three members of the Subki family (no. 7, 16, 29) who were considered by Laoust to be among the most eminent representatives of Shafi'ism and Syro-Egyptian Ash'arism,⁴⁴³ are referred to by al-Suyūtī at one and the same time.

In his argument against al-Gazālī, al-Suyūtī not only refers to the scholars of generations later than al-Gazālī, but also to a few of the latter's predecessors (no. 5 and 22). In marshalling the arguments of his own predecessors against al-Gazālī, al-Suyūtī does not follow any chronological order. He rather starts his discussion with al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277), followed by Ibn al-Šalāḥ (d. 643/1254) and Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 771/1370) and ending with al-Nawawī again.

Six of his predecessors' arguments against logic are in the form of legal opinions (*fatwās*, see, no. 2, 3, 7, 24, 25, 28); three of them in the form of poetry (no. 16, 17, 25); the rest merely consist of opinions against logic quoted from the authors' works (no. 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 18, 21) and from other works which recorded the discussions of these scholars against logic (no. 19, 23). Al-Suyūtī also refers to an argument against logic by a scholar who reported others to have opposed logic as well (no. 8, 22).

Geographically speaking, the scholars whom al-Suyūtī refers to spent their careers in different regions. Eight of them were residents of Damascus and its

⁴³⁴Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

⁴³⁵Al-Suyūtī, *al-Taḥadduth*, *op. cit.*, p. 218, 222.

⁴³⁶Al-Suyūtī, BW, p. 25-7; Al-Suyūtī, TH, 531; QM, 12,

⁴³⁷Al-Subkī, TS, X, 89.

⁴³⁸Al-Suyūtī, TH, 500.

⁴³⁹Al-Suyūtī, TH, 517.

⁴⁴⁰GAL, I, 368; Al-Suyūtī, TM, 808-9.

⁴⁴¹Al-Suyūtī, TH, 526.

⁴⁴²Al-Suyūtī, BW, p. 193-4.

⁴⁴³Laoust, H., “Ibn Taymiyya,” EI², III, 954.

surrounding cities (no. 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 16, 19, 29); three of them were from Muslim Spain (no. 5, 13, 17); twelve were inhabitants of Egypt (no. 6, 8, 11, 14, 15, 18, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28); three were Iraqis (no. 10, 11, 24); one was from Fas (no. 12); one from Yemen (no. 20) and one from Mecca (no. 26).

The indispensability of QM also lies in the fact that, with the exception of al-Gazālī, al-Nawawī, Ibn al-Salāh, Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī and Ibn Taymiyya, most of the authorities to whom al-Suyūtī refers in QM have never been referred to by modern scholars as opposing logic. Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī with his celebrated *Tabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyya*, who is often referred to by modern scholars as a scholar who played a role in consolidating the members of the Shāfi‘ite schools and not as one who opposed logic, is referred to here by al-Suyūtī as one of the prominent jurists who were against logic. This also holds true for Ibn Daqīq al-‘Id and al-Silafī, who only have been referred to by modern scholars as *mujaddids* of the seventh and eighth century of Islam and not as opposing logic. According to al-Suyūtī they also have a hostile attitude toward logic.

Although the authorities listed in QM are very few, due to their being prominent scholars who composed works dealing with the opposition against logic, QM can be said to have shed light on the history of this issue.

Al-Suyūtī’s censure against logic in QM has drawn criticism from a number of scholars, one of whom was al-Magīlī.⁴⁴⁴ This can be clearly followed in a letter by him to al-Suyūtī, which can be found in *Tarjamat al-Suyūtī*⁴⁴⁵ by al-Dāwūdī al-Mālikī,⁴⁴⁶ who stated in his *Tarjama* that al-Magīlī wrote this letter in verse that expressed his wonder concerning the fact that al-Suyūtī had composed a book to condemn logic and to prohibit people from being occupied with it.⁴⁴⁷ In the letter, al-Magīlī suggests that logic (*mantiq*) essentially leads one to the truth and guides the ignorant in order to find it.⁴⁴⁸ Likewise, logic examines the truth

⁴⁴⁴Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Magīlī al-Tilimsānī, identified by Hunwick as a reformist *faqīh* of Tlemcen and widely famed for his persecution of the Jewish community in the Algerian Sahara, was born in Tilimsān in 842/1440 and studied under a number of scholars, such as ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Thā‘ālabī (d. 875/1470) and Yaḥyā b. Yadīr al-Tadallīsī (d. 877/1477). He died in 909/1504. He was the author of twenty-six works, mainly on *fīqh* and *tawḥīd*. According to Hunwick, he was also interested in studying formal logic (*mantiq*) in favour of which he composed *Mināh al-Wahhāb fī Radd al-Fikr ‘alā al-Sawāb*, which was widely studied in West Africa. See Hunwick, J.O., “Al-Maghīlī,” EI², V, 1165-6.

⁴⁴⁵Wetzstein (abbr. WE) I 20, fol 70b-72a in Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin. I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Hans Kurio of the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, who provided me with this manuscript which comprises 31 lines. The manuscript is written in readable script and contains no lacunae. It is an undated copy of a later date. This poetic correspondence on the legal status of logic can be found in Aḥmad Bābā al-Tinbukti, *Nayl al-Ibtihāj bi-Taṭrīz al-Dībāj*, which is printed on the margins of Ibn Farhūn, *al-Dībāj al-Mudhahhab fī Ma‘rifat A‘yān al-Madhhab* (Cairo: Matba‘at al-Sā‘āda, 1329/1911), p. 330-2.

⁴⁴⁶Al-Dāwūdī is one of al-Suyūtī’s biographers and closest students, and was once commissioned by al-Suyūtī to be in charge of his books and to be responsible for any lending in the Mosque of al-Azhar, at the time of the Ottoman conquest of Egypt. See Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 72, 111.

⁴⁴⁷“wa kataba ilā ṣāḥib al-tarjama ‘ālim al-mamlaka al-takrūriyya tāj al-dīn abu ‘I-fadl muḥammad b. ‘abd al-karīm al-tilimsānī abyātan yata‘ajjabu fīhā minh ḥaythu allafā kitāban fī dhāmm al-mantiq wa ‘I-nahy ‘an al-ishtigāl bih...” See Wetzstein I 20, fol. 70b.

⁴⁴⁸WE, fol. 71a.

with regard to each speech and constitutes proof which can be made use of in argument. One is not able to find sound proof anywhere, al-Magīlī continues, but in logic.⁴⁴⁹ Al-Magīlī is aware of the fact that logic is foreign to Muslims and borrowed from the Greeks, who are infidels. However, due to its benefit in reasoning, logic is a thing the Muslim should make use of.⁴⁵⁰

⁴⁴⁹Ibidem.

⁴⁵⁰Ibidem.

Chapter Two

Jahd al-Qariha fī Tajrīd al-Naṣīḥa: al-Suyūṭī's Abridgement of Ibn Taymiyya's Naṣīḥat Ahl al-Īmān fī al-Radd 'alā Mantiq al-Yūnān

2. 1. The Date and Purpose of Abridgement of *Naṣīḥa*

The fact that JQ was not composed in the same year as QM, but rather twenty years after the latter i.e. in 888/1482, was mentioned by al-Suyūṭī in the introduction of SM: “I related in it [QM] that the *Shayh al-Islām*, one of the scholars who has reached the degree of *ijtihād*, Taqī al-Dīn b. Taymiyya composed a book to undo its foundations, which I had not found at that time. Twenty years had passed by without me having found it. Then when this year had come, and I had told of what God endowed upon me in attaining the rank of independent legal investigation, someone mentioned that one of the conditions for legal investigation was the knowledge of the art of logic, claiming that this condition lacked in me. The poor fellow did not understand that I knew it better than those who claim to know it and who defend it. I know the principles of its foundations, as well as the insights based thereon equally well as the leading logicians of today, with the exception of only our very learned teacher, Muhyī al-Dīn al-Kāfyajī [d. 879/1475]. Thus I sought for Ibn Taymiyya's book, till I found it. I saw that he had entitled it *Naṣīḥat Ahl al-Īmān fī al-Radd 'alā Mantiq al-Yūnān* [forthwith called: NAI]. In it, he expressed excellently his intention to undo its foundations one by one, while explaining the depravity of its principles. So I summarized it in a little composition which I entitled *Jahd al-Qariha fī Tajrīd al-Naṣīḥa*.⁴⁵¹”

2. 2. The Contribution Made by al-Suyūṭī in Presenting IT's Arguments more Comprehensible

JQ is an abridgement of Ibn Taymiyya's NAI. Al-Suyūṭī has abridged NAI, which, according to Hallaq, approximately consists of 138,000 words, to one third of its length, viz. approximately 32,000 words.⁴⁵² In summarizing this work, al-Suyūṭī did not try to reformulate Ibn Taymiyya's ideas or give comments on them. “In other words, his abridgement is not paraphrastic: he simply let the logical parts intact and deleted the greatest part of metaphysical digressions.” However, according to Hallaq, al-Suyūṭī can be said to have succeeded in providing a more readable NAI to the readers, and in making it a succinct treatise.⁴⁵³ Besides, al-Suyūṭī's omission of Ibn Taymiyya's metaphysical discussions in NAI and his cleansing of a good deal of the repetitions from the logical discussions, Hallaq argues, rendered “the sequence of ideas” of JQ, “superior to that found in” NAI.⁴⁵⁴

In sum, Hallaq maintains that “the overall result of al-Suyūṭī's abridgement is a more effective critique of logic than that originally formulated

⁴⁵¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 33-4.

⁴⁵²JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. liv-v.

⁴⁵³JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. lv.

⁴⁵⁴JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. liv.

by IT.⁴⁵⁵ This is in line with al-Suyūṭī's own remark when he concluded his work, JQ: "This is the end of what I have abridged from Ibn Taymiyya's treatise. I have conveyed his words *verbatim*, mostly without any change. I have omitted much of his treatise, which consists of twenty fascicles. However, I have deleted nothing of value; what I did delete was not pertinent to the main argument. The deletions are either digressions or replies to metaphysical and other queries, or repetitions, or refutations of some logicians' views that do not have bearing upon any universal principle in logic, etc. *Those who read this abridgement of mine will benefit more from it than they would should they take up the original work, for the latter is complex and difficult to use.*"⁴⁵⁶

2. 3. Elements of IT's Religious Viewpoints Against Logic and Theology in JQ

Although most of the passages of this work are replete with IT's concrete scientific criticism of each of the logical principles,⁴⁵⁷ there are some passages that can be regarded as direct expressions of IT's *religious* attitude toward logic, reflecting his censure, condemnation and legal prohibition of the study of logic. The following passages will be devoted to IT's viewpoints against logic in particular or against the sciences of the ancients in general, such as philosophy insofar as they have been maintained in the abridged work of al-Suyūṭī, viz. JQ.⁴⁵⁸

The first of these statements is very interesting, since it represents a cultural attitude shared by many religious scholars regarding the sciences of the ancients in general, and against logic in particular. The statement says: *fa innī kuntu dā'imān a'lamu anna 'l-mantiq al-yūnānī lā yaḥtāju ilayhi 'l-dhakī wa lā yantafi'u bihi 'l-balīd* (I have always known that Greek logic is neither needed by the intelligent nor of any use to the dullard).⁴⁵⁹

IT's oppositional attitude toward logic is also clearly indicated in his harsh criticism of the philosophers who adopted the principles of Aristotelian logic. Accordingly he remarks that "even the [pre-Islamic] polytheistic Arabs possessed remnants of the religion of Abraham and were thus better than the polytheistic philosophers who adopted the principles propounded by Aristotle and his likes."⁴⁶⁰

IT's opposition to logic can be seen in the words in favour of al-Sīrāfī's position maintaining that Arabic is the most noble language: "When Mattā complimented logic and claimed that intelligent people need it, Abū Sa'īd

⁴⁵⁵JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. liv.

⁴⁵⁶For this translation, I rely fully on Hallaq's translation of JQ. See JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.* p. 174.

⁴⁵⁷IT's epistemological criticism of logic is reflected in his aim to deconstruct four main theses which the logicians upheld: (1) *al-taṣawwur lā yunālu illā bi 'l-hadd* (no concept can be formed except by means of definition), (2) *al-hadd mufid tasawwur al-ashyā'* (definition leads to the conception of things), (3) *al-taṣdiq lā yunālu illā bi 'l-qiyās* (the judgement cannot be formed except by means of analogy), and (4) *al-burhān yufid al-'ilm bi 'l-taṣdiqāt* (syllogism leads to the certain knowledge of judgements). The translation of these logical concepts are quoted from JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 3-174.

⁴⁵⁸In discussing these, I fully rely on Hallaq's translation of JQ.

⁴⁵⁹JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 3.

⁴⁶⁰JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 68.

responded that there is no need for it, and that the need is rather for learning the Arabic language; for meanings are instinctive and intellective, and in need of no special convention, while Arabic is needed in order to understand meanings that must be learned. That is why learning the Arabic language – upon which the understanding of the Quran and the traditions depends – is, unlike logic, a religious obligation whenever such obligation can be fulfilled by the individual Muslim.”⁴⁶¹

Ibn Taymiyya can also be said to have pronounced as his legal opinion that the study of logic should be prohibited. This can be inferred from the following words: “The argument of the more recent scholars that the study of logic is a religious obligation incumbent upon those who are able to undertake it, and that it is one of the conditions which must be met in order to interpret the Law, is indicative of both their ignorance of the Law and the uselessness of logic.”⁴⁶²

IT’s opposition to logic is also reflected in his condemnation of the society among which logic was founded, i.e. the Greek. According to IT, “the Greeks were polytheists and worshippers of stars and idols, much worse than the Jews and Christians even after the latter had abrogated and distorted their own Scripture.”⁴⁶³

According to IT, “Muslim thinkers continue to denounce the logicians’ method and expose its weaknesses, errors, intellectual inadequacy, and inarticulateness. They have shown that such a method is more likely to corrupt the rational and linguistic faculties than to set them straight. They are not willing to adopt it in their own reasoning or in their scholarly disputations, whether these disputations are conducted against a friend or a foe.”⁴⁶⁴

In another passage, IT identifies the logicians with those whose knowledge is limited and those who have no skill in formulating concepts and clear expressions. This can be read in the following remarks: “The stronger the intellectual faculty and its conception are, the richer its expression becomes. But if the intellect and its expressions and concepts are feeble, the person possessing that intellect will be as if he were the prisoner of his own mind and tongue. Such is the case with the Greek logicians: you find them to be the most limited in knowledge and learning, the weakest in formulating concepts and clear expressions. This is why intelligent people who follow the path of the logicians when treating of the sciences employ methods that are prolix, compressed, affected, and arbitrary. All they do is to explain the obvious and clarify the intelligible. This may lead them to fall into all kinds of sophistry from which God has saved those who do not follow their path.”⁴⁶⁵

IT’s hostile attitude towards logic is also reflected in his dealing with an authority to whom he himself refers explicitly as the first who mixed logic “with Islamic principles (*bi uṣūl al-muslimīn*),”⁴⁶⁶ i.e. al-Gazālī. This is clearly indicated in IT’s words: “those who introduced this [essential definition] are the ones who

⁴⁶¹JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 100.

⁴⁶²Ibidem.

⁴⁶³JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 103.

⁴⁶⁴JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 111.

⁴⁶⁵JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 87; NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, 166-7.

⁴⁶⁶JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 154; NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 194-5..

wrote on the principles of religion and law after Abū Hāmid [al-Gazālī] - towards the end of the fifth century - and it is they who have discoursed on definitions according to the doctrine of the Greek logicians. Scholars of all other denominations - the Ash'arīs, Mu'tazilis, Karrāmīs, Shī'is, and others - hold that the function of definition is to distinguish between the definiendum and other things. This is well known in the writings of Abu 'l-Hasan al-Ash'arī, al-Qādī Abū Bakr [al-Bāqillānī], Abū Ishāq [al-Isfara'inī], Ibn Fūrak, al-Qādī Abū Ya'lā, Ibn 'Aqīl, Imām al-Haramayn, Nasafī, Abū 'Alī [al-Jubbā'ī], Abū Hāshim [al-Jubbā'ī], 'Abd al-Jabbār, al-Tūsī, Muḥammad b. al-Hayṣam, and others.⁴⁶⁷ Furthermore, it is also reflected by his reference to al-Gazālī as the one responsible for spreading the logicians' method through his including "in the beginning of his work *al-Mustasfā*, an introduction to Greek logic, and as the one who alleged that the learning of those who do not know this logic is not to be trusted."⁴⁶⁸

His criticism of al-Gazālī is also reflected by his identifying the latter as the proponent of a logical concept upheld by the logicians: *al-hadd mufid taṣawwur al-ashyā'* (definition leads to the conception of things), a logical postulate which is opposed by, IT says, almost the majority of Muslim theologians, from among the Ash'arites, Mu'tazilites, Karamites and Shi'ites, who oppose this postulate as can be seen in the works of Abu 'l-Hasan al-Ash'arī, Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī, Abū Ishāq, etc.⁴⁶⁹

Opposing this postulate and arguing against its proponents, IT then puts forward a number of arguments maintaining that definition does not lead to the conception of things: *First*, "a definition is merely a statement and claim of the definer. The statement 'man' is 'a rational animal' is a declarative proposition (*qadīyya habariyya*) and a mere claim devoid of proof. Therefore the hearer may know the truthfulness of this proposition before hearing it. This can be a proof that definition is not needed when one acquires the knowledge."⁴⁷⁰ *Secondly*, "if the definer is not able to prove the truthfulness of the definition, the hearer fails to know the defined thing. Therefore there is no need for definition. Conceptualizing the thing defined with the definition is not possible without the knowledge of the truthfulness of the saying of the definer. The truthfulness of his saying is not known by a mere definition. Thus, the defined thing cannot be known by the definition."⁴⁷¹ *Thirdly*, "definition is not needed, because to form a concept necessitates the examination of the validity of the definition. Consequently apprehending the definiendum should be preceded by apprehending of that which defines it."⁴⁷² *Fourthly*, "the use of definition depends on whether the hearer knows or not that the definiendum possesses the attributes by means of which the logicians define the definiendum. If he does not know, he will not be able to form a concept of it. If he does, he will form a concept of it without definition. Therefore, definition is not needed."⁴⁷³ *Fifthly*, "seeking concepts necessitates awareness. Once the intellect were aware of them, it

⁴⁶⁷JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 12-3.

⁴⁶⁸JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 111-12.

⁴⁶⁹JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 13.

⁴⁷⁰JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 15.

⁴⁷¹JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 16.

⁴⁷²JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 17.

⁴⁷³JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 18.

would not seek them, thus they need no definition. In short, it is awareness which is more useful than definition when one seeks and enquires a concept, since the act of seeking and enquiring presupposes awareness.”⁴⁷⁴ *Sixthly*, “their understanding of the concept of definition is based on two invalid principles: First, a quiddity has a permanent reality, other than its own existence, subsisting outside the mind. This argument is similar to the one espoused by those who hold the non-existent to be a thing. Second, the distinction between what is a necessary concomitant to quiddity and what is essential to it. This principle has no truth in it. Understanding this principle would be tantamount to saying ‘the existence together with its necessary attributes’.”⁴⁷⁵ *Seventhly*, “in a complete definition, the logicians require that a concept be formed of all its essential attributes common with other things. This means that all the attributes must be included. That is impossible.”⁴⁷⁶ *Eighthly*, “requiring that definition must include distinguishing specific differences (*fusūl mumayyiza*) along with their distinction between what is essential and what is accidental, is impossible.”⁴⁷⁷ *Ninthly*, “definition is impossible, because its argument involves circularity: the apprehension of the essence will depend on the apprehension of what the essential qualities are, and the apprehension of the essential qualities will depend on what the apprehension of the essence is. Thus, if the definiendum cannot be known without definition, and definition is impossible, then the definiendum cannot be known. This reflects the falsity of their doctrine.”⁴⁷⁸ *Tenthly*, “the disagreement amongst them concerning definition cannot be resolved in terms of [their] principles; and what entails the equalization of evidence (*takāfu' al-adilla*) [against and for the truth] is invalid.”⁴⁷⁹

IT then asserts how al-Gazālī’s introduction of logic into Islamic sciences has led many scholars to follow the latter in thinking that logic was the only existing method. Furthermore, IT remarks that “little did these thinkers know that intelligent and learned Muslims and others have denounced and decried it. Muslim thinkers have written many works about logic, and the majority of Muslims denounce it categorically because of what they have observed of its [damaging] effects and attendant consequences, which show the logicians views to be contrary to sound knowledge and faith, views that led them to all sorts of ignorance, heresy, and error.”⁴⁸⁰

IT, however, argues that al-Gazālī, as reflected in the books he wrote towards the end of his life, changed his views and maintained that the logicians’ method is false and leads to uncertainty. According to al-Gazālī, IT says, logic led him nowhere, “and has removed none of the doubt and perplexity which possessed him. To him logic was to no avail.”⁴⁸¹

Another typical remark by IT that can be regarded as having served religious ground for the opposition to logic is found in his following words:

⁴⁷⁴JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 22.

⁴⁷⁵JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 23-4.

⁴⁷⁶JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 27-8.

⁴⁷⁷JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 28-9.

⁴⁷⁸JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 29.

⁴⁷⁹JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 30.

⁴⁸⁰JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 112.

⁴⁸¹Ibidem.

“What Muslim thinkers have shown in their discussions of the Greek logic attributed to Aristotle is that the forms of the syllogism and the subject-matter that the logicians have elaborated with great efforts are of no use in the acquisition of knowledge.”⁴⁸²

Furthermore, he remarks “Muslim thinkers have held that logic does not lead to the knowledge sought after, and may constitute an obstacle in the way of attaining that knowledge because logic is tedious for the mind.”⁴⁸³

In another passage, IT remarks that “Muslim scholars continue to write in refutation of the philosophers’ logic, and to expose the errors in their discourse concerning both definition and syllogism. They also continue to expose the philosophers’ errors in metaphysics and other matters. No Muslim scholar has attached importance to their method; in fact, the Ash‘arīs, Mu‘tazilis, Karrāmis, Shī‘is, and speculative thinkers in other groups have condemned their method and exposed its falsehood. Muslim scholars have since discussed logic at too great a length to be mentioned here. The refutation of the logicians is set forth in many a theological work. In Abū Muḥammad al-Hasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbaḥī’s work *al-Ārā’ wa l-Diyānāt* there is a useful chapter (*fāṣl*) of such refutation.”⁴⁸⁴

In condemning logic, IT also refers to Ibn al-Qushayrī’s hostile verses condemning Ibn Sīnā’s *al-Shifā’*:

“We severed the ties of brotherhood with those stricken
By the malady of the book of *al-Shifā’*
How often have I said to them
You are about to be swept away by the book of *al-Shifā’*
When they made little of our warning
We turned to God and He was sufficient
They then died while following the religion of Aristotle
And we lived according to the Religion of the Chosen.”⁴⁸⁵

In opposing logic, IT also reports the event which occurred when al-Hūnajī⁴⁸⁶ was dying. According to IT, “those who were present at the deathbed of Hūnajī, the chief logician of his time, reported that just before his death he said: ‘I die knowing nothing except that the possible presupposes the necessary.’ He then added: ‘And presupposition is a negative attribute, so I die knowing nothing.’”⁴⁸⁷

In another passage, IT even condemns explicitly Ibn Sīnā, the fervent follower of Aristotle. This becomes clear from his words: “What is meant here is that Ibn Sīnā said in his autobiography that his family, his father, and his brother were heretics whom he used to hear discuss the intellect and the soul, and because of this he occupied himself with the study of philosophy. Nonetheless, despite the obvious heresy and inner disbelief of those Muslims with whom he is affiliated, their belief in God is greater than that of the ancient philosophers, such as

⁴⁸²JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 132.

⁴⁸³Ibidem.

⁴⁸⁴JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 153-4.

⁴⁸⁵JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 173.

⁴⁸⁶According to Hallaq, Afḍal al-Dīn ‘Alī Muḥammad b. Nāmāwar ‘Abd al-Malik al-Hūnajī (d. 646/1249) was “a logician who belonged to the Shāfi‘ī legal school.” JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 42, n. 57 1.

⁴⁸⁷JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 132-3.

Aristotle and his followers, whose knowledge of God is surpassed even by the [pre-Islamic] polytheistic Arabs.”⁴⁸⁸

In the same line, IT’s hostile attitude toward philosophers is clearly indicated in his remarks “Therefore the goal of the philosophers - if God leads them into some guidance – is the start of the Jews and infidel Christians, not to speak of the Muslims, the followers of the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - (*wa lihādhā kānat nihāyat al-falāsifa – idhā hadāhum allāh ba’d al-hidāya – bidāyat al-yahūd wa ʔ-naṣāra al-kuffār, fadlan ‘an al-muslimīn ummati muhammad salla ʔllāh ‘alayh wa sallama.*)”⁴⁸⁹

Along the same line, IT’s denouncement of the philosophers can also be found in his words: “Thus, the views of those philosophers became widespread among people lacking in reason and religion, such as the Karmatians and the Bāṭinīs, whose doctrine combines the philosophy of the Greeks with the religion of the Magians, although outwardly they adhere to the religion of *Rafḍ*. Of the same stock are the ignorant mystics and speculative theologians. Being heretics and hypocrites, they find fertile ground in an ignorant (*jāhiliyya*) environment which is far from knowledge and faith. They also find wide acceptance among hypocritical heretics as well as among the polytheistic Turks. They always find acceptance among the heretical and hypocritical enemies of God and of His Messenger.”⁴⁹⁰

In concluding his discussion of logic, IT fervently attacks the philosophers (logicians), revealing the falsity of their logic. This is clearly illustrated by his words: “From the foregoing it has become clear that restricting the methods for the acquisition of knowledge to those which they have stipulated in logic is false, both in content and form. It has also become clear that they have excluded from the valid sciences those which are more sublime, more imposing, and more numerous than those they have subscribed to, and that the methods they have prescribed lead to only a few contemptible sciences that are neither noble nor numerous. Such is the level of these people – in their knowledge and practice they are the lowest of all humans. In many ways, the heretical Jews and Christians are more noble in their knowledge and practice. The entirety of philosophy does not even elevate its follower to a degree equal to that of the Jews and Christians after the latter have abrogated and distorted [their own Books], let alone prior to their doing so.”⁴⁹¹

2. 4. How did al-Suyūṭī select IT’s viewpoints against logic in this Abridgement?

Hallaq is right that al-Suyūṭī in abridging NAI left the logical parts intact and deleted the metaphysical digressions in IT’s discussion.⁴⁹² Comparing JQ and NAI, it appears that the repetitive arguments of IT and his digressive discussion on metaphysical issues, which al-Suyūṭī deleted in JQ, however, contain relevant elements of IT’s religiously-based viewpoints against logic, the logicians, the

⁴⁸⁸ JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 64.

⁴⁸⁹ NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 133.

⁴⁹⁰ JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁴⁹¹ JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 172-3.

⁴⁹² JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. liv-v.

philosophers, Aristotle, the *Mutakallimūn*, etc. The following are some typical examples:

To begin with, IT, for instance, says that “those who deal with definition (*al-hudūd*) after al-Gazālī are those who deal with them following the Greek logical method.”⁴⁹³

IT’s criticism of the *Mutakallimūn* can be found for instance in his remarks that a specific group of the *Mutakallimūn* argue against the falsity of the arguments of the philosophers with false and invalid arguments.⁴⁹⁴ Accordingly, he also condemned the *Mutakallimūn* for their arguing with the philosophers in a number of questions, such as the novelty of the Universe (*ḥudūth al-‘ālam*), the attestation of the existence of the Creator (*ithbāt al-sāni*), and prophecies (*al-nubuwwāt*), by means of a false method which deviates from the Divine law (*al-shar‘*) as well as from reason (*al-‘aqīl*).⁴⁹⁵

IT’s criticism of both the *Mutakallimūn* and the philosophers is clearly voiced when he speaks of “the mistake which the philosophers committed when dealing with metaphysical questions, prophecies, the hereafter and divine laws,” which, according to IT, was “graver than that of the *Mutakallimūn*. As for what they opine concerning physical and mathematical sciences is that the philosophers are more often sound than those among the *Mutakallimūn* who argue against them. Most of the opinions of the *Mutakallimūn* concerning these issues are not based on knowledge, reason, and divine rule.” (*wa ’l-ḥaṭa’ fīmā taqawwalah al-mutafalsifa fi ’l-lilāhiyyāt wa ’l-nubuwwāt wa ’l-ma‘ād, wa ’l-sharā‘i‘ a‘zam min ḥata’ al-mutakallimīn. Wa ammā fīmā yaqūlūnah fi ’l-‘ulūm al-ṭabī‘iyya wa ’l-riyādiyya faqad yakūn ṣawāb al-mutafalsifa akthara min ṣawāb man radda ‘alayhim min ahl al-kalām fa inna akthara kalām ahl al-kalām fi hādhīh al-umūr bilā ‘ilm wa lā ‘aqīl wa lā shar‘*).⁴⁹⁶

In another passage, IT identifies the philosophers with the ones most ignorant of God, the Lord of the Universe,⁴⁹⁷ and with those whose belief is similar to that of the hypocrites who adhere to the Islamic tenet only superficially, refusing inwardly what has been prescribed by the Prophets.⁴⁹⁸ IT then illustrates their error in refusing the knowledge of God and His Attributes.⁴⁹⁹

Referring to al-Gazālī, IT also anathematizes the concepts of the philosophers dealing with the fact that God does not know the particulars, with the sempiternity of the Universe and with the rejection of the hereafter (*inkār al-ma‘ād*).⁵⁰⁰

Typical characteristics of IT’s digressions can be represented by a number of cases:

Case 1:

(1a) When dealing with a subject, IT usually treats it in detail. When he discusses definition (*al-hadd*) and syllogism (*al-qiyās*), by which a concept and

⁴⁹³NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 15.

⁴⁹⁴NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 105.

⁴⁹⁵NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 105.

⁴⁹⁶NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 311.

⁴⁹⁷NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 394.

⁴⁹⁸NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 459.

⁴⁹⁹NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 462.

⁵⁰⁰NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 523.

judgement are respectively formed, he explains the definition of *al-hadd* and its being identified with its species: *al-haqīqī*, *al-rasmī* and *al-lafzī* and that of *al-qiyās* and its being identified with its species: *al-jadali*, *al-shi'rī*, *al-sufastā'i*. IT then deals with each of the species of *al-hadd* and *al-qiyās*, the discussion of which occupies more than two printed pages of NAI.⁵⁰¹

However, IT's viewpoints on this issue, which al-Suyūtī abridges in JQ, are very concise. This can obviously be found in the following abridgement: "You ought to know that they have founded logic upon the theory of definition and its species, and upon demonstrative syllogism and its species. They have held that, inasmuch as knowledge is either a concept (*taṣawwur*) or a judgement (*taṣdīq*), the means by which a concept is formed is a definition, and that by which a judgement is formed is a syllogism. To this we say that the discussion revolves around four points, two negative and two affirmative. The first of the two [negative points] concerns their doctrine that no required concept can be formed except through a definition; and the second of the two that no required judgement can be known except by means of a syllogism. The other two [affirmative points] concern their doctrine that [1] definition leads to the knowledge of concepts, and [2] the prescribed syllogism or demonstration leads to the knowledge of judgements."⁵⁰²

It is clear that when al-Suyūtī encountered IT's lengthy discussions of subjects, he dealt only with the most essential passages and avoided the details thereof.

(1b) This also holds true for IT's lengthy discussion of the fact that definition can be challenged by means of refutation (*naqd*) and by introducing another, opposing definition (*mu'āraḍa*), the explanation of which takes up a couple of pages in NAI.⁵⁰³ Al-Suyūtī, however, abridges it in one paragraph: "Tenth, they argue that the opponent is entitled to challenge definition by means of refutation (*naqd*) – through Coextensiveness (*tard*) and Coexclusiveness ('aks) – as well as by introducing another, opposing definition (*mu'āraḍa*). If the hearer can invalidate the definition at times by Refutation and at others by Opposition, and since neither is possible without first forming a concept of the definiendum, then it becomes clear that the concept of the definiendum can be formed without definition. And this is what we sought to prove."⁵⁰⁴

(1c) The same pattern applies to IT's argument against the postulate that "definition leads to the conception of things." According to IT, this postulate is not only upheld by many scholars, among whom al-Gazālī, but also opposed by many others, among whom Abu 'l-Hasan al-Ash'arī, al-Qādī Abū Bakr [al-Bāqillānī], Abū Ishāq [al-Isfara'inī], Ibn Fūrak, al-Qādī Abū Ya'lā, Ibn 'Aqil, Imām al-Haramayn, Nasafī, Abū 'Alī [al-Jubbā'i], Abū Hāshim [al-Jubbā'i], 'Abd al-Jabbār, al-Tūsī, Muḥammad b. al-Hayṣam, etc. Furthermore, IT deals with the viewpoints of these prominent scholars on this issue, which occupies seven printed pages of NAI.⁵⁰⁵ Finally, he comes up with his refutation of al-Gazālī's viewpoints on this issue, to which purpose he devotes more than four printed

⁵⁰¹NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 47.

⁵⁰²JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 5-6.

⁵⁰³NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 11-3.

⁵⁰⁴JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 10-11.

⁵⁰⁵NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 16-22.

pages of NAI.⁵⁰⁶ As reflected in his JQ, al-Suyūtī dealt with this issue only in two paragraphs, covering eleven printed-pages.⁵⁰⁷

There are many passages which can be regarded to have followed this typical example: par. 22,⁵⁰⁸ 23,⁵⁰⁹ 29,⁵¹⁰ 30,⁵¹¹ 33,⁵¹² 34,⁵¹³ etc.

Case 2:

As suggested by Hallaq, al-Suyūtī can be said to have altered the text of NAI. This is typically illustrated by the fact that al-Suyūtī, Hallaq argues, “speaks of the four eponyms representing the surviving legal schools, whereas IT in *al-Radd* [NAI] does not limit them to four, but speaks of *madhāhib* in a general sense, including the *madhāhib* of lesser *mujtahidūn*. Thus, in addition to Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767), Mālik (d. 179/795), Shāfi‘ī (d. 204/820), and Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855), he mentions Ishaq b. Rāhawayhi (d. 238/852), al-Layth b. Sa‘d (d. 157/773), al-Awzā‘ī (d. 158/774), and Dāwud b. ‘Alī al-Zāhirī (d. 270/884).”⁵¹⁴

Case 3:

In this case, al-Suyūtī can be said to have omitted lengthy passages of NAI without giving a reason. This is clearly indicated by the following example: When arguing for the fact that “a syllogism must include a universal premiss; but the universality of the proposition cannot be known unless it be ascertained that all the particulars under that universal share one common factor, and this is done by means of analogy,” IT proposes fourteen considerations, the ninth of which is omitted altogether by al-Suyūtī in his JQ.⁵¹⁵ This omitted passage (NAI, p. 396-437), however, records IT’s lengthy discussion “against the logicians who maintained that widespread (*mashhūrāt*), and to a lesser extent estimative (*wahmiyyāt*), propositions do not lead to certain knowledge,” and his references to the viewpoints of Ibn Sīnā and al-Rāzī on this issue.⁵¹⁶

Case 4:

Al-Suyūtī has deleted IT’s metaphysical digressions. This is clearly exemplified by the fact that al-Suyūtī omitted 27 printed pages of NAI (p. 474-500) in which IT

⁵⁰⁶NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.22-7.

⁵⁰⁷JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 12.

⁵⁰⁸JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 15-6; NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.32-3.

⁵⁰⁹JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 16; NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.33-7.

⁵¹⁰Al-Suyūtī in this passage records only IT’s indication that al-Gazālī, Ibn Sīnā, al-Rāzī, al-Suhrawardī and others admitted “that definitions (*hudūd*) and names (*asma’*) have the same defining functions,” without dealing with their individual viewpoints on this issue. JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 20-1; NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.40-49.

⁵¹¹In this regard, al-Suyūtī avoids dealing with IT’s detailed discussion about the knowledge of definitions (*hudūd*) being derived from Religion. Accordingly, he also left out IT’s linguistic discussion of *al-hudūd al-lafzīyya* in relation to their legal and theological, as well as exegetical significance. JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 21-2; NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.49-61.

⁵¹²JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 24-5; NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 64-6.

⁵¹³JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 25; NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.66-9.

⁵¹⁴JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 169, n. 310 (1); NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.443-5.

⁵¹⁵JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 142-172; NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.299-472.

⁵¹⁶JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 167.

deals with a number of metaphysical topics: the celestial soul's (*nafs falakiyya*) knowledge of earthly events (*al-hawādīth fi l-arq*), the falsity of the claim that a Sufi could be informed about the content of *al-lawḥ al-mahfūz* (the Well-Preserved Tablet), *intiqāsh al-ilm fi l-hiss al-mushtarak* (extracting knowledge of the celestial soul by the common perception of earthly beings, vision (*ru'yā*), the Prophet's knowledge of the events of the past and the future, the difference between the angel and the genie and between philosophical analogy and mystical fantasy, etc.⁵¹⁷

This also holds true for the last 44 pages of NAI, in which IT deals with the following questions: the acquisition of the knowledge of the angels and the genie by the Prophets by means of their souls,⁵¹⁸ the perplexity of the astronomers on *ka'ba*,⁵¹⁹ Divine and evil inspiration,⁵²⁰ the refutation of the view that the knowledge of the unseen (*al-gayb*) is not obtained through the intermediary of the Prophets,⁵²¹ the difference between the theologians' methods and those of the philosophers (the logicians) in the acquisition of knowledge,⁵²² reprehensible and praiseworthy perdition (*al-fanā' al-madhmūm wa 'l-fanā' al-mahmūd*),⁵²³ the anathematized concepts of the philosophers on the sempiternity of the Universe, the refutation of God's knowledge of the particulars and of the hereafter,⁵²⁴ etc.

In response to these questions, al-Suyūṭī has made IT to deal with them only in two paragraphs (par. 319 and 320 of JQ)⁵²⁵ the first of which reads: "From the foregoing it has become clear that restricting the methods for the acquisition of knowledge to those which they have stipulated in logic is false, both in content and form. It has also become clear that they have excluded from the valid sciences those which are more sublime, more imposing, and more numerous than those they have subscribed to, and that the methods they have prescribed lead to only a few contemptible sciences that are neither noble nor numerous. Such is the level of these people- in their knowledge and practice. The entirety of philosophy does not even elevate its follower to a degree equal to that of the Jews and Christians after the latter have abrogated and distorted [their own Books], let alone prior to their doing so..."⁵²⁶ While paragraph 320 reads: "Someone may argue: 'Some of the logicians' views with regard to confining the methods of acquiring knowledge [to what they have prescribed] are found in the discourse of Muslim theologians. Some of the latter even espouse it *verbatim* or with changes in terminology.' We answer: not all the doctrines of the speculative theologians are true. However, all that which the messengers have brought down is true. Whatever in the views of the speculative theologians and others corresponds to what the messengers have brought down is true; whatever does not conform is false. The forefathers' and the

⁵¹⁷JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 172; NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 473-500.

⁵¹⁸NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 501-2, 505-9,

⁵¹⁹NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 502-5.

⁵²⁰NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 507-9.

⁵²¹NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 509-511.

⁵²²NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 511-523.

⁵²³NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 516-8.

⁵²⁴NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 523.

⁵²⁵JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 173-4; NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 500-545.

⁵²⁶JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 172-3.

leading scholars' condemnation of the heretically innovative speculative theologians is well known.”⁵²⁷

Al-Suyūṭī also deleted IT's lengthy discussion of a number of other questions: the polytheism of Aristotle and the Greeks,⁵²⁸ the roots of polytheism,⁵²⁹ the belief of the Sabi'ites in Harrān,⁵³⁰ the conversion of the residents of Harrān to Christianity through the mediation of Constantine,⁵³¹ the fact that all the prophets are Muslim,⁵³² remarks on the statement of Abraham: “this is my Lord (*hādhā rabbī*),”⁵³³ the philosophers' views that the souls are essentially identical,⁵³⁴ the attestation of the prophethood (*ithbāt al-nubuwwa*),⁵³⁵ the acquisition of knowledge by the soul after its being free from the body during sleep,⁵³⁶ the philosophers' attestation of the prophethood,⁵³⁷ the philosophers' view that the sainthood is more noble than prophethood,⁵³⁸ the arrival of the angel in the form of a human being,⁵³⁹ the philosophers' interpretation of the angel and the revelation,⁵⁴⁰ the task of the angels,⁵⁴¹ etc.

2. 5. The rationale of al-Suyūṭī's selection of IT's arguments in JQ

What is the rationale of al-Suyūṭī's selection of arguments in JQ?; Why did he, in his JQ, record some of IT's arguments and delete others?

Al-Suyūṭī states that the arguments he has deleted in JQ take the form of “digressions or replies to metaphysical and other queries, or repetitions, or refutations of some logicians' views that do not have bearing upon any universal principle in logic, etc.” He then added that what he “deleted was nothing of value” and “was not pertinent to the main argument.”⁵⁴²

There are, however, other cases that cast a different light on the process of abridgement. To begin with, al-Suyūṭī can be said to have purposely limited IT's frequent references to al-Gazālī. This is clearly reflected by the fact that NAI records more than 28 references by IT to al-Gazālī *as the one who upheld the principle of the logicians*,⁵⁴³ whereas JQ records only six references to him.⁵⁴⁴ This

⁵²⁷JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 173.

⁵²⁸NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.283-4.

⁵²⁹NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.285-6.

⁵³⁰NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.287-9.

⁵³¹NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.289.

⁵³²NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.290-3.

⁵³³NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.304-7.

⁵³⁴NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.483.

⁵³⁵Ibidem.

⁵³⁶NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.485-6.

⁵³⁷NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.486-7.

⁵³⁸NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.487.

⁵³⁹NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.490-1.

⁵⁴⁰NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.496-499.

⁵⁴¹NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.499-500.

⁵⁴²JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 174.

⁵⁴³See *al-Radd* (ed. Dr. Rafiq al-'Ajmi, Beirut: Dār al-Fikr al-Lubnānī, 1993) vol. I, p. 33, 42, 46, 49, 57, 64, 70, 93, 129, 130, 144, 150, 196, 199 ; vol.II, p. 34, 35, 37, 83, 84, 108, 115, 117, 184, 200, 207, 232, 243, 244.

⁵⁴⁴Actually in JQ al-Gazālī is referred to more than nine times, 6 of which mention him as one who upheld the principle of the logicians. Four references to al-Gazālī are made by al-

remarkable phenomenon may be closely related to al-Suyūtī's earlier assertion, as recorded in his QM, that al-Gazālī changed his view in favour of logic and became one of its fervent opponents. This also becomes clear from the other works we discuss in this study: i.e. SM and the *Fatwā*.

Given the fact that some of IT's arguments deleted by al-Suyūtī in JQ deal with theological questions, such as the attributes of God,⁵⁴⁵ His Oneness (*al-tawḥīd*),⁵⁴⁶ the *visio beatifica* (*al-ru'yā*),⁵⁴⁷ etc, it appears that al-Suyūtī has adapted IT's NAI so as to deal exclusively with concrete scientific criticism of logical principles and with the latter's religiously-based viewpoints against logic. It is thus clear that in abridging IT's NAI, al-Suyūtī purposely avoided IT's discussion of theological matters. Here, attention may be drawn to the fact that al-Suyūtī provided a separate work later, i.e. SM, in which he extensively dealt with theological problems and their relation to logical ones, as will be discussed in chapter three.

It is true that JQ records IT's references to the theologians more than twenty-four times. The references in JQ, however, only deal with IT's criticism of them and do not discuss their theological views as such.⁵⁴⁸

This also holds true for the fact that al-Suyūtī, in his JQ, has deleted IT's discussion of questions dealing with *fiqh* and its *uṣūl*, such as question of the *qibla*,⁵⁴⁹ and that of *ta'līl al-hukm* (legal justification).⁵⁵⁰

In sum, the rationale of al-Suyūtī's selection of certain arguments proposed by IT in NAI was closely associated to al-Suyūtī's purpose to know IT's scientific criticism of logical principles, as well as his rejection of theology and (certain) theologians, and not to his theogico-legal discussions, since these discussions were to be dealt with by al-Suyūtī separately in a work composed later (i.e. SM).

Finally, it should be said here that al-Suyūtī's attempt at selecting only utterances related to logic, and not those related to theological-legal as well as metaphysical discussions, was closely connected to his objective of abridging NAI, i.e. to demonstrate his familiarity with logic, and with its principles and his competence at differentiating theological and methaphysical subjec matters from those purely logical, to those who questioned his knowledge of logic as one of the conditions to undertake *ijtihād*. By composing this work, al-Suyūtī's own claim for *ijtihād* and *tajdīd* would be acknowledged by his contemporaries.

Suyūtī as one who "wrote treatises and tracts in refutation of sectarian and other groups" and as one who maintained "that the sciences of the philosophers are either truthful but futile or false suppositions that are not to be trusted," as well as one who withdrew himself from being occupied with logic, since it leads him to uncertainty. See (index of) JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 12, 20, 46, 48, 111, 154.

⁵⁴⁵NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.225-233, 241.

⁵⁴⁶NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.214-224.

⁵⁴⁷NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.238-241.

⁵⁴⁸JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 8, 12, 14, 15, 33, 46, 50, 51, 51, 53, 62, 66, 70, 79, 86, 99, 104, 112, 131, 148, 153, 154, 169, 172, 173.

⁵⁴⁹NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.260.

⁵⁵⁰NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p.236-8.

Chapter Three

Sawn al-Mantiq wa I-Kalām ‘an Fannay al-Mantiq wa I-Kalām: Its Manuscript, the Date and Purpose of its Composition as well as its Content and Sources

Reading al-Suyūtī’s discussion in QM and JQ as dealt with in chapter one and two, one is impressed by the amount of materials he succeeded to process. However, in his work to be discussed now, *Sawn al-Mantiq wa I-Kalām ‘an Fannay al-Mantiq wa I-Kalām*, al-Suyūtī was almost a systematic historian drawing our attention to the fact that logic and theology were opposed by Muslims of various generations and even from the earliest period of Islamic history. In his discussion of the Muslim opposition to logic, al-Suyūtī, for instance, systematically arranges his topic as follows: First he deals with the foundation of logic; then he discusses its introduction into the religious community of Islam; furthermore he discusses the historical connection between the books of *uṣūl al-fiqh* and *uṣūl al-dīn* to logic and the beginning of its spread among later scholars. Finally, he enumerates chronologically the scholars who opposed logic, beginning with al-Shāfi‘ī (d. 203/820) and ending with Ibn Taymiyya (d. 729/1329). The same pattern holds true, when dealing with the Muslim opposition to *kalām*.

3.1. Manuscript and Edition of SM

SM has been edited twice: First in 1947 by ‘Alī Sāmī al-Nashshār, who used the single manuscript of SM found in Dār al-Kutub al-Azhariyya (Majmū‘ 204) as a base for his edition;⁵⁵¹ and secondly in 1970 by Su‘āda ‘Abd al-Rāziq, who used al-Nashshār’s edition as a starting point. Although al-Nashshār was mentioned as co-editor in the 1970 edition of SM, according to Hallaq, al-Nashshār in reality did not participate in any collaborative work with Su‘āda ‘Abd al-Rāziq in preparing the second edition. He only provided her with his 1947 edition.⁵⁵²

Based on the scribe’s own statement found at the end of the manuscript, which reads: “*tamma min ḥaṭṭ muṣannifih bi-āhir yawm al-ithnayn al-hādiy wa I-‘ishrīn min shahr ramaḍān al-mu‘azzam sanat tis‘a wa thamānīn wa thamān mi‘a*, [the copying of the autograph was completed at the end of Monday, 21st of the Glorified Ramadān, of the year 889],”⁵⁵³ one is convinced that the manuscript is not an autograph, but a copy made directly by a scribe⁵⁵⁴ from an autograph by al-

⁵⁵¹Published together in the same volume with al-Suyūtī’s abridgement of Ibn al-Taymiyya’s *Naṣīḥat Ahl al-Īmān fī al-Radd ‘ala Mantiq al-Yūnān* by Maṭba‘at al-Sa‘āda (Cairo: 1947). I am indebted to Dr. N. J.G. Kaptein, the Director of the Indonesian Netherlands Cooperation in Islamic Studies (INIS), and Dr. Abdusamad Kamba, the Educational Attaché of the Indonesian Republic at Cairo, for providing me with a copy of this edition.

⁵⁵²Published together with *Jahd al-Qariḥa fī Tajrīd al-Naṣīḥa* by Dār al-Naṣr li ’l-Tibā‘a. See Hallaq, *op. cit.*, p. lvi.

⁵⁵³See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

⁵⁵⁴Al-Nashshār provides no information concerning the fact who this scribe was. Based on Sartain’s discussion of al-Suyūtī’s biography and background, one might say that the

Suyūṭī who finished writing it in 888.⁵⁵⁵ The script of the manuscript is tiny and dense but neatly arranged. Each folio is fully covered with about 52 lines and almost no lacunae are found on the pages. According to al-Nashshār, the paper of the manuscript is of one and the same type.⁵⁵⁶

The present author was only able to consult the printed editions of SM. The single manuscript of SM which is preserved in Dār al-Kutub al-Azhariyya is no longer accessible to the public. This was the information obtained by Dr. Nursamad Kamba, the Educational Attaché of the Indonesian Republic at Cairo, from the authorities of the Azhar Library, as he confirmed in a letter to Dr. N.J.G. Kaptein, the Director of the Indonesian Netherlands Cooperation in Islamic Studies (INIS) in Leiden.⁵⁵⁷ Furthermore, the manuscript as downloaded from the website www.alazharonline.org, which is provided by the Maktoum Project for preserving the manuscripts at the Azhar University, consists only of pictures of negative photographs. Though the downloaded negative images of the manuscript were converted into positive ones by a specialist in photographic and digital services at Leiden University, the result was vague and extremely difficult to decipher.

According to al-Nashshār, the edition of SM was undertaken after *Shayḥ Muṣṭafā ‘Abd al-Rāziq* had come across the manuscript and asked al-Nashshār's assistance in preparing of it for publication. Due to the former being appointed as a Minister of *Waqt*, al-Nashshār then did the work alone.⁵⁵⁸

As acknowledged in his first edition of the manuscript, al-Nashshār attempted to correct some grammatical and linguistical mistakes found in the text, to make clear some difficult expressions, and also to add some missing phrases in square brackets. For these corrections, al-Nashshār referred to *Qūt al-Qulūb* by Abū Ṭalib al-Makkī (d. 383/994),⁵⁵⁹ *Jāmi‘ al-Bayān* by Abū ‘Umar Yūsuf b. ‘Abd al-Barr al-Nimarī (d. 463/1071),⁵⁶⁰ *Fayṣal al-Tafriqa bayn al-Imān wa ’l-Zandaqa*⁵⁶¹ and *Iḥyā’ ’Ulūm al-Dīn*⁵⁶² by al-Gazālī (d. 505/1112) as well as *Mu’jam*

scribe most probably refers to ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Shādhilī, who was known as al-Suyūṭī's pupil, biographer and one of the most important copyists of his works. This was reflected in a number of facts, one of which states that the Syrians sent him a present, because they were so pleased with his accuracy. They also requested that he alone should copy al-Suyūṭī's works for them. Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 34, 36, 49.

⁵⁵⁵ Al-Suyūṭī indicates this information indirectly in his introduction of SM, by explaining that twenty years after he had completed *al-Qawl al-Mushriq* in 867 or 868/1464, he composed SM, due to the fact that he was challenged by his opponents to prove himself well-versed in logic and, hence deserving to undertake *ijtihād*. See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

⁵⁵⁶ See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

⁵⁵⁷ Dated November 18, 2003.

⁵⁵⁸ For the forewords of the *Shayḥ Muṣṭafā ‘Abd al-Rāziq* and those of ‘Alī Sāmī al-Nashshār, See the introduction of SM, *op. cit.*

⁵⁵⁹ *Qūt al-Qulūb*, which was referred to by al-Nashshār, was published in Cairo by al-Matba‘a al-Munīriyya in 1932. See SM (1947), *op. cit.*, p. 125, n. 2.

⁵⁶⁰ Al-Nashshār confirmed to have referred to *Jāmi‘ Bayān al-Ilm wa Faḍlīh* (Cairo: al-Matba‘a al-Munīriyya, 1946). See SM (1947), *op. cit.*, p. 132, n. 1.

⁵⁶¹ In his note, al-Nashshār confirmed to have referred to two editions of *al-Tafriqa*: First, the edition of al-Hāniṭī (1343/1924), and secondly, that of what he referred to as the edition of Cairo (1353/1934). See SM (1947), *op. cit.*, p. 183, n. 2.

al-Udabā' by Yāqūt al-Hamawī (d. 624/1229).⁵⁶³ Al-Nashshār also identifies a great deal of prominent figures (*al-a'lam*) featured in the text of SM in the annotations and makes references to the Koranic verses cited in the text.⁵⁶⁴

Being comissioned by Dr. 'Abd al-Ḥalim Maḥmūd, General Custodian of *Majma‘ al-Buhūth al-Islāmiyya* to present to the readers with the new edition of SM in a new and elegant form provided with references based on three works abridged in SM, respectively *al-Ri‘āya* by al-Muḥāsibī (d. 243/858),⁵⁶⁵ *Kitāb al-Shari‘a* by al-Ājurrī (d. 360/972),⁵⁶⁶ and *Kitāb Halq Af‘al al-‘Ibād* by al-Buhārī (d. 256/870),⁵⁶⁷ which were published after the publication of the 1st edition of SM, Su‘āda ‘Abd al-Rāziq prepared the second edition of SM.⁵⁶⁸ Her contribution consisted in collating al-Nashshār’s edition with the three works mentioned before. This was reflected in the fact that she added on the basis of these works a total number of seven notes in which she proposed corrections to the SM edition of 1947. Furthermore, she redivided the text into smaller paragraphs.

Apart from two no-longer-extant works against *kalām*, *al-Gunya ‘an al-Kalām* by al-Haṭṭābī (d. 388/988) and *al-Intiṣār li Ahl al-Hadīth* by Abū al-Muẓaffar al-Sam‘ānī (d. 562/1166), all works abridged in SM have been published. The following are the abridged works in SM, which were not used by them due to the fact that these had either not been edited or were not at their disposal at the time they edited the text: *Dhamm al-Kalām wa Ahlīh* by Abū Ismā‘il b. Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Anṣārī al-Harawī (d. ca. 481/1089),⁵⁶⁹ *Ṣarīḥ al-Sunna* by al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923),⁵⁷⁰ *Sharḥ Uṣūl I‘tiqād Ahl al-Sunna* by Abu ’l-Qāsim Hibat Allāh b. al-Hasan b. al-Manṣūr al-Ṭabarī al-Lālakā’ī (d. 418/1028),⁵⁷¹ and *Sharaf Aṣḥāb al-Hadīth* by al-Ḥaṭīb al-Bagdādī (d. 463/1071).⁵⁷²

⁵⁶²The *Iḥyā'* which was referred to by al-Nashshār here was that published in 1302/1885 (al-Tab'a al-Azhariyya al-Miṣriyya). See SM (1947), *op. cit.*, p. 188, n. 7.

⁵⁶³When editing the text of the Debate between al-Sirāfi and Mattā, al-Nashshār confirmed to have compared the text which was recorded in *Mu‘jam al-Udabā'* as edited by Margoliouth (JRAS, London: 1905, p. 79-130). See SM (1947), *op. cit.*, p. 190, n. 2.

⁵⁶⁴In the introduction of SM, *op. cit.*

⁵⁶⁵Su‘āda confirmed to have referred to *Kitāb al-Ri‘āya li Huqūq Allāh* (London: Luzac & Co., 1940), ed. M. Smith. See SM (1970), *op. cit.*, p. 126, n. 1.

⁵⁶⁶Su‘āda confirmed to have referred to *Kitāb al-Shari‘a*, which was edited by *al-Shayḥ Muḥammad Hāmid al-Faqī* (1369/1950). See SM (1970), *op. cit.*, p. 168, n. 2.

⁵⁶⁷*Kitāb Halq Af‘al al-‘ibād*, referred to by Su‘āda, was that published in India (in 1305/1888). See SM (1970), *op. cit.*, p. 131, n. 2.

⁵⁶⁸For the forewords of Dr. 'Abd al-Ḥalim Maḥmūd, General Custodian of *Majma‘ al-Buhūth al-Islāmiyya* and the introduction of the editor, see SM, *op. cit.*, p. 5-10.

⁵⁶⁹This work was published in Beirut by Dār al-Fikr al-Lubnānī in 1994 and edited by Dr. Samīḥ Dugaym based on MSS. preserved in the British Museum in London (reg. 1571: 27520).

⁵⁷⁰This work was edited by D. Sourdel in “Une Profession de Foi de l’Historien al-Ṭabarī,” in *Revue des Etudes Islamique* (1968) XXXVI, fasc. 2.

⁵⁷¹*Sharḥ Uṣūl I‘tiqād Ahl al-Sunna wa Ḥamā‘a* (Riyāḍ: Dār Ṭayyiba, 1985), ed. Dr. Ahmad Sa‘ad Ḥamdān.

⁵⁷²*Sharaf Aṣḥāb al-Hadīth* by Abū Bakr al-Ḥaṭīb al-Bagdādī (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basimevi, 1971), ed. Muḥammad Sa‘id Ḥaṭīboğlu.

3.2. Date of Composition of SM

The date of composition of this work can be found in its introduction, in which al-Suyūṭī says: "Long ago, in the year 867 or 868 [H] I composed a book on the prohibition of being occupied with the art of logic, which I named "*aI-Qawl al-Mushriq*" into which I included the statements of the learned men of Islam condemning and prohibiting it. I related in it that the *Shayh al-Islām*, one of the scholars who has reached the degree of *ijtihād*⁵⁷³ Taqī al-Dīn b. Taymiyya composed a book to undo its foundations, which I had not found at that time. Then, twenty years passed by without finding it. Then when this year had come, and I had told of what God endowed upon me in attaining the rank of independent legal investigation, someone mentioned that one of the conditions for legal investigation is the knowledge of the art of logic claiming that this condition lacked in me.⁵⁷⁴ The poor fellow⁵⁷⁵ did not understand that I knew it better than those who claim to know it and who defend it. I know the principles of its foundations, and on that basis I derived therefrom the insights as well as the knowledge rendered by the leading logicians of today, with the exception of only our very learned teacher Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Kāfyajī.⁵⁷⁶ Thus I sought for Ibn Taymiyya's book, till I found it. I saw that he had entitled it *Nasīhat Ahl al-Imān fī ՚I-Radd ՚alā Mantiq al-Yūnān*. In it, he expressed excellently his intention to undo its foundations one by one and explain the corruption of its principles. So I summarized it in a little composition which I entitled *Jahd al-Qariha fī Tajrīd al-Nasīha*. Then, many of the charlatans, who are far removed from real scholarship, eagerly said: What is the argument to prohibit it? On what sources did Ibn al-Šalāḥ rely for his legal decision to that effect? And other expressions of a similar nature. Surprisingly, they defend logic but they do not master it, and they are busying themselves with it but they do not use it in their inquiries, they go about

⁵⁷³ *Ijtihād*, according to Schacht, is the use of individual reasoning, obtained by means of analogy, which is applied to the Koran and the custom of the Prophet. Schacht, J., "Idjtihād," in EI², III, 1026.

⁵⁷⁴ "... wa man lā yuhītu bihī falā thiqata lahū bi ՚ulūmihī ašlan..." The first who heralds this - as generally claimed - is al-Gazālī, in the introduction of *al-Mustāṣfā fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh* (Cairo: Al-Maṭba՚a al-Amīriyya, 1322/1904), I, 10.

⁵⁷⁵ This probably refers to one of al-Suyūṭī's chief opponents, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ՚Abd al-Mun՚im al-Jawjarī, one of his rivals ever since they had been in the Hijaz together as students in 869/1464-5. Al-Jawjarī, according to Sartain, called a meeting for a formal debate in the presence of the sultan, emirs and other notables. Being responsive to the calling, al-Suyūṭī, Sartain narrates, requested the presence of two other *mujtahids* besides himself - one to debate with him and the other as a referee - since he could not debate with any individual of inferior status. See Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

⁵⁷⁶ Muḥyī al-Dīn Abū ՚Abd Allāh al-Kāfyajī the Ḥanafite": Muḥammad b. Sulaymān b. Sa՚d b. Maṣ’ūd al-Rūmī al-Bargamī, born in 788/1387 and died in 879/1475, was given the surname al-Kāfyajī because of his occupation with the book *al-Kāfiya* on grammar (Sartain, *op. cit.*, 29-124). He was one of al-Suyūṭī's teachers, under whom the latter studied for 14 years. He was referred to by al-Shak՚a as *ustādh al-wujūd*. Muṣṭafā al-Shak՚a, *Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī: Masīratuhū al-՚Ilmiyya wa Mabāhithuhū al-Lugawiyā* (Cairo: Dār al-Miṣriyya al-Lubnāniyya, 1994), p. 14.

it at random like the weak-sighted she-camel that beats the ground with her fore feet and they only follow the right direction in discussion and deduction in blindness.

Some of those who spent their life [studying] logic met me. When they saw the statement of Ibn al-Šalāḥ regarding his legal opinions: *Wa laysa al-iṣṭigāl bi ta‘allumiḥī wa ta‘ilmihī mimmā abāhahu ‘l-shāri‘ wa la ‘stibāhahū aḥad min al-ṣahāba wa ‘l-tābi‘īn wa ‘l-a‘imma al-mujtahidīn wa ‘l-salaf al-ṣāliḥīn* (studying and teaching logic is not allowed by the Law-giver, by the Companions, the Followers and by the leading scholars who are qualified to undertake *ijtihād*, nor by the Pious Ancestors), they said: This is a testimony to the contrary, which is not accepted. Thus, I said: By God, you neither followed the course of the scholars of religious law nor relied upon that of the logicians!

Thus, I decided to compose an elaborate book [to prohibit it]⁵⁷⁷ following the course of a comprehensive independent legal investigation and deduction, revealing the truth, in which I explain the correctness of what Ibn al-Šalāḥ claimed in relating the negation of the permission [of being occupied with logic] to the mentioned people.

When I had begun [to compose the book], and was obliged to mention the statements of the leading scholars in the prohibition of the study of theology, because of the intricate connection between the two, I entitled the book *Sawn al-Manṭiq wa ‘l-Kalām ‘an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa ‘l-Kalām* (to Defend [Islamic] Logic and Theology against the Art of [Greek] Logic and Theology], but only God enables us to reach our goal.”⁵⁷⁸

From the passages above, it becomes clear that SM was composed in 887 or 888/1484, twenty years after QM, which was composed in 867 or 868/1464.

Neither is there any doubt that SM was composed after JQ. This is based on al-Suyūṭī’s own report in SM, as mentioned before, that he had summarized Ibn Taymiyya’s *Nasīḥa* in a little composition which he entitled JQ. But many of the charlatans, i.e. his opponents, al-Suyūṭī complains, eagerly asked him what the argument was to prohibit logic; on what sources did Ibn Šalāḥ rely for his legal decision, etc.⁵⁷⁹

Evidently, in his SM al-Suyūṭī can be said to have sometimes relied on JQ. He, for instance, quotes verses by Ibn al-Qushayrī, which were cited by Ibn Taymiyya in his *Nasīḥa*:

“We cut off our friendship with those stricken by the malady of *Kitāb al-Shifā’*.

They died as adherents to the religion of Aristotle, while we died in the religion of the Chosen.”⁵⁸⁰

3.3. Background and Purpose of the Composition of SM

Before we can understand al-Suyūṭī’s purpose for the composition of SM, we should grasp the context in which this work was composed. In his work, *The Gate of Ijtihād*, Hallaq suggests that the first incident in Islamic legal history in

⁵⁷⁷The original sentence is cut off here. Perhaps it is *fī tāḥrīmih* [to prohibit it].

⁵⁷⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 33-6.

⁵⁷⁹SM, p. 33.

⁵⁸⁰JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 173; NAI (al-Radd), *op. cit.*, p. 510-511.

which the *muqallids* openly opposed the claims of a *mujtahid* concerned al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505). This is closely related to al-Suyūṭī's claim for *ijtihād* and *tajdīd*, as can be read in several of his treatises and *fatwās*. As described in his *al-Radd ‘alā man Aḥlada ila ʔ-l-Ard wa Jahila anna ʔ-ijtihād fī kull ‘asr fard*, al-Suyūṭī, for instance, argues that the task of *ijtihād* should be fulfilled by the Muslim community because it was a collective duty (*fard kifāya*). If there were no *Mujtahids*, al-Suyūṭī maintains, the community would have agreed upon an error.⁵⁸¹

According to Hallaq, al-Suyūṭī's claim for *ijtihād* was contested by the majority of his contemporaries, not because he had not fulfilled the qualifying conditions to be *mujtahid*, but because of 'immense self-confidence' and 'boastfulness'.⁵⁸² For instance, it was asserted by al-Suyūṭī himself that he had attained "the rank of *ijtihād* in *al-ahkām al-shar‘iyya*, in prophetic Tradition and in the Arabic language, an achievement unequalled by anyone since the time of Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 756/1355), who was the last scholar in whom these three kinds of *ijtihād* were united." According to Sartain, al-Suyūṭī in his treatises and *fatwās* often condemned his adversaries as fools. In *al-Lafż al-Jawharī fī Radd Hubāt al-Jawjarī* (the jewelled statement in refutation of al-Jawjarī's ravings), for instance, Sartain argues, al-Suyūṭī condemns al-Jawjarī, who has disgraced the former's position as one of the '*ulamā'*'.⁵⁸³

In light of the arguments mentioned above, it can be said that the purpose of the composition of SM is closely connected to al-Suyūṭī's claim for *ijtihād*. Since logic, as claimed by his opponents, was a necessary pre-condition to gain the appellation of *mujtahid*, al-Suyūṭī felt urged to prove to his opponents that he was well-versed in logic and its basic principles. However, following the course of his predecessors, who negated the permission of being occupied with logic, by composing the work, al-Suyūṭī also proved to be an independent scholar prohibiting logic.⁵⁸⁴

Admittedly, by composing SM, al-Suyūṭī not only wanted to prohibit the study of logic, but also put forward the statements of the leading scholars who prohibited the study of theology, for which he abridged a dozen of the works by his predecessors, ranging from *al-Ri‘āya* by al-Muḥāsibī (d. 243/858), *al-Gunyā ‘an al-Kalām* by al-Ḥaṭṭābī (d. 388/988) to *al-Intiṣār li Ahl al-Hadīth* by al-Sam‘ānī (d. 562/1166).

3.4. The Contents of SM

Examining SM at a glance, one might hastily conclude that in arranging his material, al-Suyūṭī did not use any particular method of division. He simply introduces the work and then begins to discuss one subject after another. But if one pays more attention to the structure of the book, one becomes aware that al-Suyūṭī is almost a systematic historian who draws our attention to the fact that

⁵⁸¹Hallaq, W., *The Gate of Ijtihād: A Study of Islamic Legal History* (University Microfilms international, 1983), p. 76-8; Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 62-3.

⁵⁸²Hallaq, *ibidem*.

⁵⁸³Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 61-3.

⁵⁸⁴See Ali, Mufti, "Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī against Logic and Kalām: Analysis and Significance of *Sawn al-Mantiq wa ʔ-l-Kalām ‘an Fannay al-Mantiq wa ʔ-l-Kalām*," in *Hamdard Islamicus*, Pakistan (2005), Vol. XXVIII, no. 2, p. 25.

logic and theology had been subjected to Muslim opposition during various generations. Based on the 1970 edition of SM, al-Suyūtī's arrangement of his arguments against logic and theology can be clearly seen. The following are the topics of discussion:

- | | |
|--|------------|
| [1]. Introduction, the Reason for Composing the Book | p. 33-36 |
| [2]. Discussion on the Origin and the Foundation of Logic, on its Introduction into the Religious Community of Islam, and those who connected the Books of <i>Uṣūl al-Fiqh</i> and <i>Uṣūl al-Dīn</i> to Logic, as well as its Spread among the Later Scholars | p. 36-46 |
| [3]. Discussion on the Leading Scholars of the Muslims who condemned or Prohibited Logic explicitly | p. 47 |
| [4]. Discussion on the Statement of <i>al-Imām al-Shāfi‘ī</i> dealing with the Prohibition of Logic | p. 47-50 |
| [5]. The First to ask about the Ambiguous Passages of the Koran was ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṣabīg | p. 50-51 |
| [6]. The Prohibition to study Theology of <i>al-Shāfi‘ī</i> | p. 52-55 |
| [7]. Discussion of a Reason for Innovation | p. 55-63 |
| [8]. Discussion of the Reasons why <i>al-Shāfi‘ī</i> and other leading Scholars Prohibited <i>Kalām</i> and the Philosophical sciences | p. 64-67 |
| [9]. The Statements of Leading Muslim Scholars on the Prohibition of <i>Kalām</i> | |
| [a]. <i>Dhamm al-Kalām wa Ahlih</i> by al-Harawī | p. 68-126 |
| [b]. <i>Al-Ri‘āya</i> by al-Muḥāsibī | p. 126-130 |
| [c]. <i>Kitāb Halq Af‘āl al-‘Ibād</i> by al-Buhārī | p. 131-132 |
| [d]. <i>Sarīḥ al-Sunna</i> by al-Ṭabarī | p. 133-137 |
| [e]. <i>Al-Gunya ‘an al-Kalām</i> by al-Ḥattābī | p. 137-147 |
| [f]. <i>Sharḥ Uṣūl I‘tiqād Ahl al-Sunna</i> by al-Lālakā‘ī | p. 148- |
| 168 | |
| [g]. <i>Kitāb al-Shari‘ā</i> by al-Ājurrī | p. 168-173 |
| [h]. <i>Qūt al-Qulūb</i> by Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī | p. 173-181 |
| [i]. <i>Jāmi‘ al-Bayān</i> by Abū ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-Barr | p. 182-192 |
| [j]. <i>Sharaf Aṣḥāb al-Hadīth</i> by al-Ḥaṭīb al-Bagdādī | p. 192-197 |
| [k]. <i>Al-Intiṣār li Ahl al-Hadīth</i> by Ibn al-Sam‘ānī | p. 198-236 |
| [l]. The Statement of Imām al-Ḥaramayn | p. 236-237 |
| [m]. <i>al-Tafriqa bayna l-Islām wa l-Zandaqa</i> by al-Gazālī | p. 237-241 |
| [n]. <i>Iḥyā’ Ulūm al-Dīn</i> by al-Gazālī | p. 241-243 |
| [10]. The Debate between Abū Sa‘īd al-Sirāfī and Mattā b. Yūnus | p. 243-255 |
| [11]. Discussion on the Refutation by the Learned Men of one who introduced Logic into <i>Uṣūl al-Fiqh</i> | p. 255 |
| [12]. Discussion on the Refutation of One who Introduced Logic into Grammar | p. 255 |

[1]. Introduction, Reason of Composing the Book

In this *Muqaddima*, referring to Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, al-Suyūtī, as discussed before (see above sub-chapter no. 3.2.), explains the background of his composing SM and indicates the reason why he entitled his work as such.

[2]. Discussion on the Origin and the Foundation of Logic, on its Introduction into the Religious Community of Islam, and on those who connected the Books of *Uṣūl al-Fiqh* and *Uṣūl al-Din* to Logic, as well as on its Spread among the Later Scholars

In this chapter, al-Suyūṭī attempts to answer systematically a number of questions revolving around the questions: (1) who was the founder of Logic and how it was founded; (2) When Logic was first introduced into the community of Islam; (3) Who undertook the pioneering attempt to connect the books of *uṣūl* to logic; and (4) Who was responsible for the spread of logic among the later scholars.

Referring to Ibn Taymiyya, al-Suyūṭī maintains that the first to found Logic was Aristotle, a Greek who first proposed the idea of the sempiternity of the universe, one of those who are “atheists” and “infidels.”⁵⁸⁵ He also remarks: “The foundation of logic was initially derived from geometry. They expressed it in figures similar to the figures of geometry. They named them limits (*hudūd*) because of the limits of those figures, in order that they were able to shift from a sensibly perceived form to an intellectual form. He [viz. Ibn Taymiyya] said that this was due to the weakness of their intellect and their failure to know them except by means of a far-fetched method. But God paved the way for Muslims to obtain such a degree of knowledge, eloquence, good deeds and faith that they excell by it all kinds of the species of man.”⁵⁸⁶

Basing himself on *al-Hujja ‘alā Tārik al-Maḥajja* [the Argument against one who Abandons the *Maḥajja* (the Proved Way) by *al-Shayḥ* Naṣr al-Maqdisī (d. 490/1098) and on *Sharḥ Lāmiyyat al-‘Ajām* by al-Ṣalāḥ al-Ṣafadī (d. 746/1345), al-Suyūṭī convincingly argues that Logic first entered the religious community of Islam when the caliphate was removed from the Umayyads and fell to the Abbasids whose dynasty was based on the support and the rule of the Persians, who bore in their hearts “infidelity” and hatred towards the Arabs and the dynasty of Islam. The exact process of the introduction of logic into the Muslim world took place, according to al-Suyūṭī, through the importation of the books of Greekdom to the world of Islam.⁵⁸⁷ Furthermore, regarding the process of the translation of the Greek books and the methods thereof, al-Suyūṭī comes with lengthy remarks: “The first of their innovations was the importation of the books of Greekdom to the world of Islam. They were translated into Arabic, and thus became widespread among the Muslims. The man responsible for the importation of the books from Byzantium into the Lands of Islam was Yaḥyā b. Ḥālid b. Barmak.⁵⁸⁸ There were books of Greekdom in Byzantium; the King of Byzantium feared that if the Byzantines would study the books of Greekdom, they would leave Christianity behind and return to the religion of Greekdom. Thus, they would start to quarrel and their unity would be broken up. Therefore, he collected the books in a place on which he built a construction which was covered by stones and gypsum in order that no one had access to it.

⁵⁸⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 36-7.

⁵⁸⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

⁵⁸⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

⁵⁸⁸Yaḥyā b. Ḥālid was appointed *wazīr* by Hārūn al-Rashīd. He was appointed Governor of Āz̄arbayzān in 158/775. In 161/778 he became a secretary tutor to Prince Hārūn, and he remained in office for 17 years, from 170/786 to 187/803. See Sourdel, D [W. Barthold],, “al-Barāmika,” in EI², I, 1033-6.

When the command of the dynasty of the Abbasids fell to Yaḥyā b. Ḥālid, who was an atheist, he received news about the books in the edifice in Byzantium. So he bribed the King of the Byzantines of his time with presents, without asking from him anything in return. When he had sent him many presents, the King of Byzantium collected his patriarchs, saying: This man, the servant of the Arab has given me a lot of presents, but without asking anything from me in return. But I am convinced that he desires something. I fear that his need will bring me difficulties. Thus, I am worried. Then, when Yaḥyā's envoy came to him, he asked him: Tell your friend that if he has a need, he should mention it. When the envoy told Yaḥyā, he answered him: What I need is that the books which are under the building, will be sent to me. I will take out from them some that I need, and send back the rest to him. When the King of Byzantium had read his [Yaḥyā's] letter, he danced with joy. Then he gathered the patriarchs, the bishops and the monks, declaring before them: I have told you that the servant of the Arab did indeed have a need. He has expressed it and it is very trivial to me. I have an idea to which you will listen. If you acquiesce with it I will decide upon it; if you have a different view, we will consult together, till we share the same opinion. They asked [the King] : What is it? He answered: He wants to have the Greek books. He will take what he likes and return the rest. Then they said: What do you think ? He said: I know that our ancestor only constructed the building because he feared that if the books would fall into the hands of the Christians, who would read them, this would lead to the corruption of their religion and the demolition of their unity. So I decided to send them, asking him not to send them back, in order that they will be afflicted by them, while we get rid of their evil! Because I am afraid that someone after me will dare to spread them among the people, so that what frightens the Christians will happen to them. Then they said: Yes we agree, King! Please, execute this plan!

Thus he sent the books to Yaḥyā b. Ḥālid. When the books came to him, he gathered all the heretics and philosophers. When he took out the book *Hadd al-Mantiq* [on the definition of logic], Abū Muḥammad b. Abī Zayd said: There have been few to read this book, that have been saved from heresy. He said: Then Yaḥyā organized discussions and debates in his house concerning unappropriate subjects. Every adherent of a religion spoke about his belief and discussed it while his [personal] safety was secured.

I say the implication of these words is that it took place in the Caliphate of al-Rashīd,⁵⁸⁹ as al-Barmakī was his minister. During his life, he fell out of favor. He was murdered in 187 [H].

In his *Sharḥ Lāmiyyat al-‘Ajam* al-Ṣalāḥ al-Safadī said: It is told that al-Ma’mūn, when he had concluded a truce with a Christian king- I think that he was king of the island of Cyprus- wrote a letter asking from him the library of the Greeks. They were collected there in a house which no one could enter. The king gathered his advisors and consulted with them about it. All of them advised him not to supply the books, except for one patriarch. He said: Supply the books to them, these sciences have not entered any religious state without destroying it and ensnaring its scholars.

⁵⁸⁹Al-Rashīd bi ’llāh, Abū Ja‘far al-Manṣūr, the thirtieth ‘Abbasid Caliph, the son of al-Mustarshid, was born ca. 501/1107-8. He was appointed caliph after his father’s death in 529/1135. He died in 532/1138. See Hillenbrand, C., “al-Rashīd,” in EI², VIII, 439-40.

A reliable man told me that *al-Shayḥ Taqī al-Dīn b. Aḥmad b. Taymiyya* - may God have mercy upon him - used to say: I do not think that God will overlook [the sins of] al-Ma'mūn. He certainly will retribute him for what he has done to this community by his introduction of these philosophical sciences among the people. Or words to that effect.

Then al-Ṣafadī said: Actually, al-Ma'mūn was not the first to translate and arabicize [foreign books], but there have been many [scholars] who translated them before him. Thus, Yahyā b. Ḥālid arabicized a lot of Persian books, like *Kalīla wa-Dimna*, and for his sake the *Almagest*, one of the books of the Greeks,⁵⁹⁰ was arabicized.⁵⁹¹

It is generally known that the first to translate the books of the Greeks was Ḥālid b. Yazīd b. Mu'āwiya, since he was extremely fond of the books of chemistry.

The translators followed two methods: The first was the method of Yūḥannā b. al-Bitrīq,⁵⁹² Ibn al-Nā'imā al-Ḥimsī⁵⁹³ and others, namely that one examine every single Greek word and its meaning, and then proposes a single Arabic word synonymous in meaning with the Greek one, thereby to explain it. One then moves to the next word and does the same, until he completes what he wanted to translate. This method is bad for two reasons: The first is that one cannot find Arabic synonyms for each and every Greek word. Hence, it often happened that Greek words were rendered by Arabic ones signifying the opposite. Secondly, the peculiarities of [Arabic] construction and syntax do not always match their correlatives in another language. Besides, many mistakes may occur when metaphors are used, which is frequently the case in all languages.

(The second method of translation) is the method of Ḥunayn b. Ishāq [d. ca. 260/873],⁵⁹⁴ al-Jawharī [d. 393/1002]⁵⁹⁵ and others, namely that one examines a

⁵⁹⁰ *Kitāb al-Majistī*, to the Arab astronomers, was the name of the great astronomical work by Ptolemy (the great compilation). Al-Ya'qūbī says in his historical work (written in 278/891, ed. M. th. Houtsma, Leiden 1883, p. 151): "The book *al-Madjistī* treats of the science of the stars and their movements; the meaning of *al-Madjistī* is 'the greatest book'". See Suter, H., "al-Magest," in EI1, I, 313.

⁵⁹¹ An elaborate discussion of this issue can be found in Van Koningsveld's "Greek Manuscripts," *op. cit.*, p. 345-372.

⁵⁹² Yūḥannā b. al-Bitrīq was a younger contemporary of Ḥunayn b. Ishāq with whose aid he translated *De Antidotes*. It is related that he was the physician of al-Muwaffaq Ṭalha (d. 276/891) brother and mainstay of the weak Ḥālīf al-Mu'tamid. His son Bitrīq b. Yūḥannā was a physician to the Caliph al-Muqtadir and al-Raḍī. He died in 329/941. See Meyerhof, Max, "New Light on Ḥunain b. Ishāq and his Period," in ISIS: *International Review Devoted to the History of Science and its Civilisation* (1926), VIII, 685-724.

⁵⁹³ Abd al-Masiḥ b. Abd Allāh b. Nā'imā al-Ḥimsī was a translator who worked for the Caliph al-Mu'taṣim (218-27/833-42). See Lyons, C.W., "Uthūlūdjiyā," in EI2, X, 954-5.

⁵⁹⁴ Ḥunayn b. Ishāq Abū Zayd died in ca. 260/873. He was the headmaster of the well-known school of translation. He lived in Bagdad during the reigns and partly at the court of ten Caliphs, viz. Al-Amīn (809-813), al-Ma'mūn (d. 216/833), al-Mu'taṣim (d. 225/842), al-Wathīq (d. 231/847), al-Mutawakkil (d. 245/861), al-Muntaṣir (d. 246/862), al-Muṣtaṣīn (d. 250/866), al-Mu'tazz (d. 253/869), al-Muhtadī (d. 254/870), and al-Mu'tamid (870-892). See Meyerhof, *op. cit.*, p. 685-720.

⁵⁹⁵ Perhaps this refers to Abū Naṣr Ismā'il b. Hammād al-Jawharī, a celebrated Arabic lexicographer of Turkish origin who died in ca. 393/1002-3. His fame was related to his

sentence and understands its meaning. One should then express its meaning in a correlative sentence in the other language, regardless of the fact whether or not the words correspond exactly. This method is more appropriate. Because of this, the books of Ḥunayn b. Ishāq need no revision, except for [his works] on mathematic, because he did not master [this field], contrary to the works on medicine, logic, physics and theology. The works he translated in these fields do not need correction. As for *Euclid*,⁵⁹⁶ it was revised by Thābit b. Qurra al-Harrānī [d. 288/901],⁵⁹⁷ and the same holds true for the *Almajest* and the intermediate works between the two.”⁵⁹⁸

At the end of his discussion in these passages, al-Suyūṭī comes to the conclusion “that the sciences of the Ancients had reached the Muslims in the first century when they had conquered the lands of the non-Arabs. But they had not spread among them widely and had not become generally known among them, since the ancestors had prohibited one to become engrossed in them. However, [the Greek sciences] became popular in al-Barmakī’s period, while their spread increased in the period of al-Ma’mūn because of the innovations he stimulated and the occupation with the sciences of the Ancients as well as the extinguishing of the Sunna which he promoted.”⁵⁹⁹

Dealing with the third question, al-Suyūṭī quotes Ibn Taymiyya as having said: “Never had anyone of the Muslim thinkers paid attention to the method of the logicians. Nay, the Ash‘arites, the Mu‘tazilites, the Karramites, the Shi‘ites and the other denominations condemned logic and asserted its corruption. The first who mixed logic with the *uṣūl* of the Muslims was Abū Hāmid al-Gazālī. Muslim scholars disputed about him, so frequently that it would take too long to enumerate them all here.”⁶⁰⁰

With respect to the fourth question, relying on Ibn Kathīr, al-Suyūṭī points to al-Ṭūsī (d. 672/1274) who “made the astronomical laboratory” and “a House of Wisdom in which there were philosophers. Each of them earned three *dirhams* per day. There was also a House of Medicine for the medical doctors, who earned two *dirhams*. To each *Muhaddith* who worked in *Dār al-Ḥadīth*, half a *dirham* was paid per day. From that time, the occupation with philosophical sciences became widespread and prominent.”⁶⁰¹

monumental dictionary *Tāj al-Luga wa ʔ-ṣihāḥ al-‘Arabiyya*. See Kopf, L., “al-Djawharī,” in EI², II, 495-7.

⁵⁹⁶Euclid is one of the most well-known mathematicians. His name has been synonymous with geometry up until the twentieth century. He lived after the pupils of Plato (d. 397 BC) and before Archimedes (d. 287 BC). He taught in Alexandria. Euclid's fame rests preeminently upon the *Elements*, written in thirteen books. According to Bussard, a translation of *Elements* was made by Ishāq b. Ḥunayn (d. 295/910) son of the most famous of the Arabic translators, Ḥunayn b. Ishāq. See H.L.L. Busard, “the First Latin Translation of Euclid's Elements commonly ascribed to Adelard of Bath,” in *Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies*, (1983), p. 1-3.

⁵⁹⁷According to Busard, Thābit b. Qurra (d. 288/901) was a scholar who prepared the second recension of Euclid's *Elements*. He was a scholar who in his own right holds a major position within the history of Islamic mathematics. See Busard, *op. cit.* p. 3.

⁵⁹⁸SM, *op. cit.* p. 39-43.

⁵⁹⁹SM, *op. cit.* p. 44-5.

⁶⁰⁰SM, *op. cit.* p. 46.

⁶⁰¹Ibidem.

This chapter can be regarded as a testimony to the fact that al-Suyūṭī was well-versed not only in the history of logic, but also in that of its introduction to the community of Islam, through the importation of Greek books and the translation movement.

[3]. Discussion of the Leading Muslim Scholars who Condemned or Prohibited Logic Explicitly

Having provided a historical overview of logic, and its inception in the Muslim world, al-Suyūṭī introduces a number of depreciatory views on logic, the first of which is al-Shāfi‘ī’s. The reason why al-Suyūṭī came with these topics is explicitly stated in his following remark: “There is no doubt that a scholar who has reached the degree of *ijtihād* is not allowed to fabricate a statement never expressed by any scholar before, or to put forth an opinion which has not been expressed before. Hence, one of the preconditions for an independent legal investigation (*ijtihād*) is the knowledge of the statements - both unequivocal and controversial - of scholars from among the Companions and after them. In order not to undermine the agreement concerning the view he chooses, he is obliged to mention the sayings of the scholars which are relevant to this subject before establishing the proof, so that the book is composed following the method of *ijtihād*.

Therefore I say: As for the Companions - with whom God may be well-pleased - the Followers, and their Followers, no declaration of any sort concerning it has reached us from them, because it did not exist in their time. It only started at the end of the second century, as mentioned before. In that time, *al-Imām* al-Shāfi‘ī - with whom God may be well-pleased - was alive, so he discussed it. He was the oldest of whom I found that he expressed a depreciatory view concerning it.”⁶⁰²

[4]. Discussion of the Statement of *al-Imām* al-Shāfi‘ī dealing with the Prohibition of Logic

From the passage above, it is clear that the reason why al-Suyūṭī should deal first with the statement of al-Shāfi‘ī against logic is due to two facts (1) that al-Shāfi‘ī, according to al-Suyūṭī, was the oldest to express a depreciatory view concerning logic; and (2) that no one from among the Companions, the Followers and their Followers before al-Shāfi‘ī condemned logic.

In this chapter, al-Suyūṭī provides us with some information concerning al-Shāfi‘ī’s attitude towards logic. Referring to *al-Tadhkira* by the Shafi‘ite ‘Izz al-Dīn b. Jamā‘a (d.767/1366), al-Suyūṭī quotes al-Shāfi‘ī as having said that the ignorance of the people and their controversies are only caused by the fact that they left behind the language of the Arabs and developed a preference for the language of Aristotle.⁶⁰³ Al-Shāfi‘ī went on asserting, according to al-Suyūṭī, that the people’s neglect of the language of the Arabs and their preference for the language of Aristotle brought about the emergence of the dispute on the createdness of the Koran, the negation of the divine vision and other innovations.⁶⁰⁴ In al-Suyūṭī’s words, al-Shāfi‘ī also maintained that the people should not interpret the Arabic texts in accordance with the language of the

⁶⁰²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

⁶⁰³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

⁶⁰⁴Ibidem.

Greeks and the logic of Aristotle which follows a certain system different from that of the language of the Arabs. According to al-Shāfi‘ī, the Koran and the Tradition used the terminology of the Arabs and their thoughts, not the terminologies of the Greeks.⁶⁰⁵

Referring to al-Shāfi‘ī, al-Suyūtī argues that whoever shifts from the tongue of religion, namely Arabic, to another tongue and renders the existing religious texts in accordance with it, is ignorant and goes astray. Then al-Suyūtī mentions an example of how his teacher, al-Kafyajī, was criticized by Hanafite jurists, because he did not apply the basic rules of argumentation of the *fiqh* (*qawānīn al-fiqh*), but those of logical deduction.⁶⁰⁶

Furthermore, al-Suyūtī remarks that “the aim of this discussion is the explanation of the statement of al-Shāfi‘ī - with whom God may be well-pleased - namely that whoever renders the Koran, the Sunna and the *Shari‘a* according to the requirements of the principles of logic, will not attain the goal of the (divine) laws; if he applies [those logical principles] to solve derivative cases (*al-furū‘*), he will be accused of an error; while if he applies them to solve the principal ones (*al-usūl*), he will be accused of an innovation. This is the weightiest argument for the prohibition of this art, because it is the cause of fabrication and innovation, contrary to the Sunna as well as the aim of the legislator. It suffices [us] therefore as proof, derived from the words of al-Shāfi‘ī - may God be pleased with him!

Corresponding to [the above-mentioned prohibition] is the prohibition of speculating about the ambiguous [passages] of the Koran out of fear of distortion and dissension. The two *Shayhs*⁶⁰⁷ and others related about ‘Ā’isha that she said: the Messenger of God - may God bless him and grant him peace - recited this verse: ‘He it is who hath sent down to thee the Book: in it are clearly formulated verses; these are the essence of the Book: other (verses) are ambiguous. Now as for those in whose hearts is an inclination to stray, they follow the ambiguous parts of it, out of desire of dissension, and seek their explanation, though no one knows their explanation except Allāh: No one takes warning but those of insight.’⁶⁰⁸ He said: If you see the ones who follow the ambiguous passages of [the Koran], [then know that] those are the ones whom God named, and beware of them!”

Concluding this chapter, al-Suyūtī suggests that one of the foremost reasons why al-Shāfi‘ī prohibited logic is the fact that it is the cause of fabrication and innovation, contrary to the Sunna and the aim of the Legislator.⁶⁰⁹

[5]. The First who asked about the Ambiguous Passages of the Koran was ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṣabīg

Why did al-Suyūtī discuss the question of the ambiguous passages of the Koran? And what is its relation to his discussion on the prohibition of logic, theology and philosophical sciences as well as the sciences of the ancients? The answer to the first question was given by al-Suyūtī in his following remark: “For this very reason, al-Shāfi‘ī - may God be pleased with him – prohibited the study of

⁶⁰⁵Ibidem.

⁶⁰⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

⁶⁰⁷This appellation belongs to al-Buḥārī and Muslim.

⁶⁰⁸Āli ‘Imrān (III) : 5, Bell, I, 44-5.

⁶⁰⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

theology. Al-Harawī produced in his book on the Condemnation of Theology (*Kitāb Dhamm al-Kalām*), through his chain of transmitters going back to al-Shāfi‘ī, that he said: It was narrated concerning the theologians and ‘Umar [b. al-Haṭṭāb]’s verdict of Ṣabīg⁶¹⁰ that this [verdict] from him indicates that the effective reason for him to prohibit the study of theology was his fear for its stimulation of confusions and its leading to innovations. Thus he forbade it, based on an analogy with the prohibition of speculating about the ambiguous passages of the Koran. This analogy is sound.”

The answer to the second question can be found in al-Suyūtī’s assumption founded on al-Gazālī’s view that “philosophy is not a separate science, but it comprises four parts: The first is geometry and calculation; the second is logic; the third is theology; and the fourth is physics.”⁶¹¹

Referring to the *Ta’rīh* by Ibn Kathīr (d. 744/1345) and that by Ibn ‘Asākir (d. 571/1176) and the *Musnad* by al-Dārimī (d. 282/895), al-Suyūtī narrates the story of Ṣabīg through various chains of transmission. In the story it was stated that ‘Umar b. al-Haṭṭāb punished Ṣabīg by means of a lashing with date stalks and by ordering people to banish the latter and stop his payment and sustenance, because of his questions, dealing with: (1) a variant reading (*ḥarf*)⁶¹² of the Koran, (2) the ambiguous passages of the Koran and (3) difficult passages of the Koran.⁶¹³

Some other examples of theological issues following those raised by Ṣabīg are related to questions on (1) *qadar*,⁶¹⁴ (2) the attributes of God and (3) the dispute on accidents and substances. According to al-Suyūtī, al-Harawī adduced the following words from al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad⁶¹⁵ who passed by the people discussing *qadar* “Talk about what you heard from what God has mentioned in His Book, and refrain from a thing from which God has refrained!”⁶¹⁶ When asked about the nature of innovations, Mālik b. Anas identified them with the dispute on the names of God, His attributes, His speech, His knowledge and His

⁶¹⁰In *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ*, Ṣabīg, according to al-Nashshār, is identified with Amīr b. ‘Asīl who used to seek to confuse people with ambiguous words and questions. See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 50, n. 4 (N).

⁶¹¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

⁶¹²*Harf* may mean various ways of reading the Koran, as it is attached to the expression *al-ahruf al-sab'a*, sometimes identified with *al-qirā'a al-sab'a* of the prophetic tradition “unzila al-qur'ān 'alā sab'atī al-ahruf” and another tradition: “... qāla: faqulnā innamā 'ytalafnā fī al-qirā'a. qāla: fa 'hmarra wajh rasūl allāh wa qāla: innamā halaka man kāna qablukum bī 'ytilāfihim baynahum...” See Mukarram, ‘Abd al-‘Ālī Sālim, et. al, *Mu'jam al-Qirā'at al-Qur'āniyya* (Kuwait: Matbū‘at Jāmi‘at al-Kuwayt, 1406/1986) I, 32.

⁶¹³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 50-1.

⁶¹⁴This term refers to God’s decree, the question of which, according to Gardet, was one of the most frequently debated, right from the first centuries on. This term is always combined into the expression *al-qadā' wa'l-qadar* which constitutes, according to Gardet, a kind of binary technical term of *'ilm al-kalām*. These two words also signify both the Decrees of God, the eternal decree (the most frequent meaning of *qadā'*) and the decree given existence in time (the most frequent meaning of *qadar*). Those who centered their discussions around the question of *qadar* are identified with the Qadirites. Gardet, L., “Kadā' wa'l-Kadar,” in EI², IV, 365-7.

⁶¹⁵Al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr al-Ṣiddīq died in 107/726. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 92, n. 5 (N).

⁶¹⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

will.⁶¹⁷ Likewise, when asked about the accidents and the substances, Abū Ḥanīfa said that they both were the affair of the philosophers.⁶¹⁸

[6]. Al-Shāfi‘ī’s Prohibition of the Study of Theology

According to al-Suyūṭī, al-Shāfi‘ī’s prohibition of theology was based on an analogy with the prohibition of speculating about the ambiguous passages of the Koran, as already condemned by ‘Umar b. al-Ḫatṭāb.⁶¹⁹

This also holds true, according to al-Suyūṭī, for the prohibition of logic. He further argues: “This very effective cause can in fact be found in logic as well, as mentioned by al-Shāfi‘ī. So the evidence for the prohibition of the study of it is deducted analogically from the original case to which theology was compared, namely the ambiguous [verses of the Koran] which it is explicitly forbidden to speculate about. This is a valid analogy which is weakened neither by a contradiction nor an objection. Maybe, the opponent [of this kind of analogy] refutes the existence of the effective cause mentioned in logic, but this kind of refutation is [a kind of] contention. No attention should be paid to it, because induction and deduction invalidate it.”⁶²⁰ Emphasizing al-Shāfi‘ī’s prohibition of theology, Al-Suyūṭī suggests that the scholars of the ancient generation condemned the study of theology, because its origin was to be found among the materialist philosophers.⁶²¹

Al-Suyūṭī then explains how two ambiguous passages of the Koran and one prophetic tradition became the object of baseless interpretation by one of the leading scholars in the rational sciences (*a’immat al-ma’qūlāt*). One of these verses reads: “If there were any gods in the two of them except Allah, they would both go to ruin....”⁶²² In his view, this verse is *dalīl iqnā’ī* (convincing argument), as he interpreted it according to the principles of logical deduction (*qawā’id al-istidlāl al-manṭiqi*).⁶²³ However, the Arabs and the Muslims after them, to whom the Koran was revealed, followed the authorities in the science of rhetoric (*balāga*) who saw this verse as a specimen of a special stylistic feature of the Koran which they called “speculative argumentation” (*al-iḥtijāj al-naẓari*). Thus they considered this verse on those linguistic grounds as one of the weightiest arguments for the unity of God. Furthermore al-Suyūṭī suggests that “logic does not lead [us] to anything good. Whoever pays attention to it, is far removed from grasping the objectives of the *Shari‘a*. Thus there is a grave distance between him and the religious truths.”⁶²⁴

Al-Suyūṭī also mentions another Koranic verse which became the object of their arbitrary interpretation: “They will ask thee about the new moons ...” until the end of the verse.⁶²⁵ The same man’s interpretation of this verse, according to al-Suyūṭī, is reflected by his words: “They [viz. the inquirers

⁶¹⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

⁶¹⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

⁶¹⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

⁶²⁰Ibidem.

⁶²¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

⁶²²Al-Anbiyā’ (XXI): 22. Bell, I, 306..

⁶²³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

⁶²⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

⁶²⁵Al-Baqara (II): 185, Bell, I, 26.

mentioned in the verse above] asked about the crescent why it first appears slightly and then increases gradually until it is full. They were answered with an explanation of the wisdom therein, while he avoided to answer what they had asked about [viz. the crescent], because they did not belong to those who were [able] to obtain information about the details of astronomy easily.”⁶²⁶

According to al-Suyūṭī, this answer was wrong, for several reasons: “*First*, the Occasions of the Revelation indicate that they [viz. the inquirers mentioned in the verse] asked about the *ḥikma* not about the person referred to. *Secondly*, it is unworthy to suspect of the Companions - may God be pleased with them!- who had a deeper understanding than all non-Arabs and than the whole *ummā*, that they did not belong to those who investigate the details of astronomy easily, while individuals among the later non-Arab [scholars] have investigated them. *Thirdly*, [because according to him], it was beyond the Divine omnipotence to convey that to their minds through an expression which they could comprehend. *Fourthly*, the Companions - may God be pleased with them - have studied many details of religious jurisprudence, difficult parts of the laws of inheritance, as well as of the acts of the soul. What is the science of astronomy in comparison to that? It is more despicable and contemptible, even if it was based on a principle which deserves to be taken into consideration. No doubt, most of it is baseless and not supported by any argument. In contrast, arguments derived from Prophetic traditions and reports point to the contrary, as I [viz. al-Suyūṭī] explained in a separate composition. The author of the treatise [I am quoting] was daring enough to try to plunge through it and through similar other works on the philosophical sciences and the fascination of intellectual abstrusenesses, with the result that he even thought that it would only be easy for him and for his equals and that it would be impossible for anyone [else] to grasp them easily, even the Companions! But to Allah we belong, and to Him is our return!”⁶²⁷

[7]. Discussion of a Reason for Innovation

Emphasizing al-Shafī’ī’s view that the reason for innovation is the ignorance of Arabic, al-Suyūṭī then turns to exemplify how the ignorance of Arabic has misled people in the interpretation of Koranic verses. Those ignorant of Arabic are referred to by al-Suyūṭī, who relies on *al-Ta’rīh al-Kabīr* by al-Buhārī, as being in accordance with what al-Hasan al-Baṣrī has said: “The only thing destroying them was their lack of Arabic!”⁶²⁸

Al-Suyūṭī refers here to *Ta’wīl Mushkil al-Qur’ān* by Ibn Qutayba (276/889)⁶²⁹ who stressed that “the only person who knows the excellence of the Koran is the one who often studied it and has a broad knowledge [of it] and understands the ways of expression of the Arabs, the influence on the styles [of

⁶²⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

⁶²⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 54-5.

⁶²⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

⁶²⁹Ibn Qutayba, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh b. Muslim al-Dīnawarī, born at Kūfa in 213/828, was “one of the great Sunnī polygraphs of the 3rd/9th century, being both a theologian and a writer of *adab*.” He died in Bagdad in 276/889. His *Ta’wil Mushkil al-Qur’ān* was published in Cairo in 1373/1954 and edited by Aḥmad Ṣaqr. See Lecomte, G., “Ibn Qutayba,” in EI², III, 844-7.

expressions] as well [the points by which] God has distinguished the language of the Arabs from all the [other] languages.”⁶³⁰

Concluding his discussion, al-Suyūṭī asserts that “the Koran was revealed in accordance with all these rules. Therefore no one of the translators was able to translate it into any of the languages like the *Injil* was translated from the Syriac language to the Abyssinian and Greek. The Torah, the Book of Psalms and the other books of God -the Exalted and the Eternal- were translated into Arabic, because the metaphors of the non-Arabs are not of the same extensive range as those of the Arabs.”⁶³¹

As has been discussed before, the speculation on the ambiguous verses of the Koran was the original case from which the prohibition of theology was deduced analogically. The effective cause for both the prohibition of the speculation on the ambiguous verses of the Koran and of theology is the stimulation of confusion leading to innovations. Because this effective cause is also found in logic, philosophy and some of the sciences of the ancients, al-Suyūṭī argues, studying them is also forbidden.

In this chapter al-Suyūṭī asserts that the reason why people speculated about the ambiguous verses of the Koran was their lack of sufficient Arabic. An imperative which can be understood from al-Suyūṭī’s argument enumerated in this chapter and in earlier chapters is the fact that it is necessary for people to master Arabic well, rather than to be occupied with speculations which stimulate confusions and lead to dissension.

Al-Suyūṭī concludes: “the reason for the prohibition of the study of theology is the fact that there is no command [to make use of it], which can be found in the Koran and the Sunna. No discussion about it can be found among the ancestors. This is also the case with logic, namely that there is no command [to make use of it] to be found in the Koran and the Sunna; there is no discussion by the ancestors about it, contrary to Arabic the study of which is commanded in the Tradition and the discussion about which can be found among the ancestors.”⁶³²

As mentioned before, al-Suyūṭī stated the reason why al-Shāfi‘ī prohibited the study of theology, i.e. the latter’s fear that theology stimulates confusion and leads people to innovations. In this chapter, al-Suyūṭī adds two more reasons why theology was prohibited by al-Shāfi‘ī. According to al-Suyūṭī, the second reason was the fact that there is no command to make use of theology to be found in the Koran and the Sunna. No discussion about it can be found among the ancestors. The third reason is the fact that the style of theology is different from that of the Koran and the Sunna. Referring to al-Harawī on the authority of Abū Thawr, al-Suyūṭī quotes al-Shāfi‘ī as having said: “My judgement of theologians is that they should be beaten with a palm-branch, put on a camel, displayed around the communities and tribes and their offences publicly announced: ‘This is the punishment for those who have neglected the Koran and the Sunna and approached theology.’ ”⁶³³

⁶³⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

⁶³¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

⁶³²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

⁶³³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 645.

According to al-Suyūṭī, al-Shāfi‘ī not only condemned logic and theology, but also philosophy. This is reflected in the latter’s statement which was reported by al-Harawī: “If you hear a man saying that the name is not identical to the object [named] and that a thing is identical to nothing, then testify against him that he is a heretic!”⁶³⁴

[8]. Discussion of the Reasons why al-Shāfi‘ī and other leading Scholars Prohibited *Kalām* and the Philosophical sciences

Abū Ḥanīfa also explicitly condemned philosophy. This is reported by al-Harawī, who says: “Tayyib b. Aḥmad told me - Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn told us - Abu ’l-Qāsim b. Matawayh told us that Ḥāmid b. Rustam related to us that al-Ḥasan b. al-Muṭī’ that Ibrāhīm b. Rustam on the authority of... said: I said to Abū Ḥanīfa: What do you comment on the disputes people innovated about the forms and bodies? Then he said: [these are] the utterances of the philosophers. You have to follow the tradition and the course of the ancestors, beware of any novelties because they are innovations. This was also produced by Ibn al-Sam‘ānī in *Kitāb al-Intisār [li Ahl al-Hadīth]*, who said: ‘a reliable man from among our friends related to us that al-Shayh Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī related to us that Abū al-Qāsim b. Matawayh told it to us.’”⁶³⁵

Referring again to al-Harawī, al-Suyūṭī also mentions Mālik b. Anas as having censured theology: “‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Mahdī has said: I came to see Mālik, whom was being asked a question by a man. He said: Maybe you are one of ‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd [d.ca. 144/761]’s⁶³⁶ adherents. God has cursed ‘Amr, because he fabricated the innovations of theology. If theology was a [real] science, the Companions and the Followers would have discussed it, as they have discussed the religious rules and laws.”⁶³⁷

[9]. The Statements of Leading Muslim Scholars on the Prohibition of *Kalām*

Consistent with his model of argumentation against his opponents, in chapter [9] al-Suyūṭī incorporated into the work we are discussing the texts which he abridged from twelve works of predecessors he considered opponents of *kalām*. Al-Suyūṭī’s motive for abridging the works of his predecessors can be inferred from the general introduction of his abridgement: “*I’lam anna aimma ahl al-Sunna mā’ zālū’ yuṣannifūn al-kutub fī dhamm ‘ilm al-kalām, wa ’l-linkār ‘alā muṭa‘ātih* (know that the leading Muslim scholars of the People of the *Sunna* and the *Jamā‘a* have continuously been composing books to condemn the science of *kalām* as well as to refute its partisans)”.⁶³⁸

[a]. *Kitāb Dhamm ‘Ilm Kalām wa Ahlih* by al-Harawī

⁶³⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

⁶³⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

⁶³⁶‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd, according to Watt, was one of the first members of the Mu‘tazilite school of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī. His reputation rests on his asceticism. One of his famous followers was Bishr b. al-Mu‘tamir (d. 210/825). See Watt, W.M., “‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd,” in EI², I, 454.

⁶³⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

⁶³⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

Under the title *Nuṣūs al-A’imma fī Tahrīm al-Kalām*, al-Suyūṭī first discusses *Kitāb Dhamm al-Kalām wa Ahlih*, by *Shayḥ al-Islām Ismā‘il al-Harawī*. His reason to put the abridgement of the work of al-Harawī at the very beginning becomes clear from his following remark: “*Wa ajallu kitāb ullifa fī dhālika kitāb dhamm al-kalām wa ahlih li shayḥ al-Islām Abī Ismā‘il al-Harawī. Wa huwa mujalladun kulluhū muḥraj bi l-asānid, wa anā’ ulahhiṣu hunā jami‘a maqāṣidihī talḥīṣan ḥasanān* (The most excellent work in that respect [to condemn *kalām* and its authors] is *Kitāb Dhamm al-Kalām wa Ahlih* of *Shayḥ al-Islām Abū Ismā‘il al-Harawī*. The format of this book is a bound volume. All information is given with the chains of transmission, and here I abridge all its purposes adequately”).⁶³⁹ Beaurecueil has qualified this work as “a principal source for the history of the struggle against rational theology in Islam.”⁶⁴⁰ Al-Suyūṭī’s abridgement of DhK occupies approximately one fourth (60 printed pages) of SM (of 227 printed pages).

According to al-Suyūṭī, al-Harawī’s complete name was *Abū Ismā‘il ‘Alī b. Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Anṣārī al-Harawī*. He was a Hanbalite scholar, a *Hāfiẓ* of tradition, an expert in language, a prominent figure in *tasawwuf*, a great savant who established the Sunna and rejected innovations, and the author of *Kitāb Manāzil al-Sā’irin*.⁶⁴¹ According to Brockelmann, al-Harawī was born in Kuhendiz in the citadel of Herat on the 2nd of Sha‘bān 396/4th of May 1005.⁶⁴² His father, *Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad*, whose genealogy goes back to a Companion, *Abū Ayyūb Ḥālid b. Zayd Ḥazrajī*, who accommodated the Prophet Muḥammad during his arrival in Madina, was a devotee merchant who taught his son to be puritan and to love science. His father was also a *sūfī* who practiced the mystical teaching rigorously. Regarding his mother, no information can be found in any biographical dictionaries.

He studied *hadīth* and *tafsīr* in early age under the supervision of *Abū Manṣūr al-Azdī* and *Yahyā b. ‘Ammār*. In 417/1026, he went to study in Nishāpūr, where he became a disciple of *al-Asamm*. On the way to Mecca for a pilgrimage, he stayed in Bagdad for some time to attend the lectures of *Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥalal*. When he returned from the pilgrimage, he met *Abu ‘l-Ḥirqānī*, who would have a decisive influence on his mystical career.

Although al-Harawī had followed the supervision of Shafi‘ite teachers during the early stages of his studies, he adopted Hanbalism with enthusiasm due to its devotion to the Koran and the Sunna.⁶⁴³

He was appointed professor by *Nizām al-Mulk* in the end of 480/1087, several years after having been given the title of *Shayḥ al-Islām*, bestowed upon him by *al-Muqtadir bi ‘llāh* in 474/1081, because of his high position in the Hanbalite school.⁶⁴⁴ He died in the city of his birth, on the 22nd of Dhu ‘l-Hijja 481/8th of March 1088.⁶⁴⁵

⁶³⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

⁶⁴⁰Beaurecueil, S.D., “al-Anṣārī al-Harawī,” in EI², I., 515.

⁶⁴¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

⁶⁴²GAL, S.I, p. 773.

⁶⁴³Beaurecueil, S.D., *Khwāḍja ‘Abdullah Anṣārī (396-481/1006-1089) Mystique Hanbalite* (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1963), p.23-77.

⁶⁴⁴GAL, I, p. 433, S.I, p. 773.

⁶⁴⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

According to al-Hashshash, besides *Dhamm al-Kalām* and *Manāzil al-Sā’irīn*, al-Harawī composed a number of works: *Kitāb al-Arba’īn fi ’l-Tawhīd*, *Kitāb al-Arba’īn fi ’l-Sunna*, *al-Fārūq fi ’l-Sifāt*, *Sharḥ Ḥadīth kull bid’ā ḏalāla*, *Takfīr al-Qadariyya*, *Takfīr al-Jahmiyya*, *Tafsīr al-Qur’ān al-Majīd* and *Manāqib al-Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbāl*.⁶⁴⁶

According to Brockelmann, the manuscripts of DhK are preserved in two places:

1. In Maktaba al-Zāhiriyah (the manuscript is now preserved in Maktaba al-Asad) in Damascus (reg. 1138)
2. In the British Museum in London (reg. 1571: 27520)⁶⁴⁷

The manuscript of the Asad library, registered no. 1138, consists of 149 folios. Each folio consists of two pages, each of which has twenty lines. The manuscript is not an autograph. It is rather a copy made in the eighth century of the Hijra. It is mentioned at the end of the manuscript that it was copied on Thursday, 24th of Dhū ’l-Qa’da 747/1347.⁶⁴⁸

There exist two editions of DhK. *First*, the edition published in Beirut by Dār al-Fikr al-Lubnāni in 1994 and edited by Dr. Samīḥ Dugaym.⁶⁴⁹ *Secondly*, in the form of a published Ph.D thesis by Muḥammad al-Hashshash, who also translated some parts of it into German.⁶⁵⁰

The DhK was, according to Beaurecueil, the fruit of al-Harawī’s labour against the partisans of Ash’arism and Mu’tazilism due to which he was “threatened with death on five occasions.”⁶⁵¹ (2) However, al-Hashshash has indicated that the motivation for al-Harawī to compose this work was that he wanted to give to the partisans of hanbalism the necessary principles to find the truth by means of obeying the Koran and the Sunna and avoiding *kalām*.⁶⁵²

To understand in which way al-Suyūṭī used *Dhamm al-Kalām* by al-Harawī as the chief source for his discussion of the opposition against *kalām*, it is significant to see how al-Harawī organizes his argument in his work. Based on the edition of Dr. Samīḥ Dugaym (1994), the organization of the contents of this work can be seen in following table:

Introduction	17-24	
Chapter I: The ancient <i>Ummas</i> followed the sound path, as long as they clung to obedience and observance; whenever they disputed and debated, they went astray and perished	25-38	
Chapter II: Emphasizing that the Prophet used to worry about the <i>Umma</i> with respect to leading scholars who led others astray and disputed on religious matters, and with respect to hypocritical preachers	39-44	
Chapter III: The abhorrence of pronouncing and softening speech as well as of speaking impolitely	45-48	
Chapter IV: Censuring and Condemning Debate as well as	49-54	

⁶⁴⁶ Al-Hashshash, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

⁶⁴⁷ GAL, I, p. 433.

⁶⁴⁸ MSS. Fol. 149 b.

⁶⁴⁹ This edition is at my disposal.

⁶⁵⁰ Al-Hashshash, *op. cit.*

⁶⁵¹ Beaurecueil, EI², I, 515.

⁶⁵² Al-Hashshash, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

Mentioning its misfortunes	
Chapter V: The virtue of avoiding the dispute even if its practitioner is in the right	55-57
Chapter VI: The Chosen One's - may God bless him and grant him peace - Condemnation of Debating the Koran and his warning to those who partake in it	58-61
Chapter VII: The Chosen One's anathematization of the dispute on the Koran and his prohibition of it	62-70
Chapter VIII: Establishing the evidence for the falsity of the opinion of those who maintain that the Koran is in no need of the Tradition	71-81
Chapter IX: Emphasizing the opposition of Tradition to reason	82-111
Chapter X: The abhorrence of the Chosen One and his best Umma against the deep occupation [with religious disputation]	112-127
Chapter XI: The abhorrence of being extravagant in matters of religion and of the dissimulation in it as well as of the study of the essences and necessity of obedience	128-141
Chapter XII: The worry of the Prophet and the Pious Ancestors Regarding those occupied by the words of the People of the Books and those who dedicate themselves to the Book of God the Almighty	142-152
Chapter XIII: The Prophet's information to his <i>Umma</i> on the status of the theologians among them	153-160
Chapter XIV: Mentioning issues emerging in the period of the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace	161-177
Chapter XV: The Refutation of leading Muslim scholars regarding the captious questions, complicated speech, vague words, debates, deviating <i>ta'wil</i> ⁶⁵³ and the occupation with it, which the <i>Mutakallimūn</i> undertook, and their views on them according to [their] generations	178-245
Al-Shāfi'i's Attack against the <i>Mutakallimūn</i> and his Refutation [of them]	246-259
Discussing Ishāq b. Rāhawayh's Refutation of them [the <i>Mutakallimūn</i>]	260-284
Chapter on the fact that the innovators, the theologians and the	284-290

⁶⁵³Eventhough, there was no difference in the early history of the Koranic exegesis between *ta'wil* and *tafsīr*, most scholars distinguish them. The former is based upon reason and personal opinion (*ra'y*), whereas *tafsīr* is based upon materials derived from the Prophet himself or his Companions or the Successors in the form of *hadith*. Hence, *ta'wil* is popularly identified with *tafsīr bi I-ra'y*, and *tafsīr* with *tafsīr bi I-ma'thūr*. See Poonawala, I, "Ta'wil," in IE², X, 390-392; McAuliffe, however, says: "although apparently synonymous in the earliest period, the significations of *tafsīr* and *ta'wil* began to diverge as the Qur'anic sciences developed in the classical period. *Tafsīr* remained the term of more limited denotation, often restricted largely to philological exegesis, while *ta'wil* connoted hermeneutical approaches that sought to uncover deeper meanings in the text or to align the text with particular theological or philosophical orientations." See McAuliffe, Jane Dammen, *Qur'anic Christians: An Analysis of Classical and Modern Exegesis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 18, n. 15.

transgressors are cursed	
Chapter on the abhorrence of studying under the guidance of the <i>Mutakallimūn</i> and the Innovators	291-297
Chapter on the Exaltation of those who uphold good tradition or those who call [others] to it	298-306
Chapter Discussing the Statement of al-Ash‘arī	307-318

It is clear that some chapters (which are highlighted in bold) were left unabridged. The reason for this was presumably that al-Suyūtī deemed these chapters redundant to his argument against the *Mutakallimūn*. Moreover, the last chapter discussing the statement of al-Ash‘arī cannot be used as a ‘weapon’ against the *Mutakallimūn*, since it contains arguments in favour of theology by the eponym of Ash‘arite theology. (2) In his abridgement of DhK, al-Suyūtī has cut all long chains of transmission, mentioning only the closest authority to the source. (3) He has left out long digressive discussions and variant readings of traditions, as well as information of a similar nature repeated by al-Harawī. (4) At several occasions, al-Suyūtī also paraphrases al-Harawī’s discussion against *kalām*. Al-Suyūtī, for instance, says: “The author [al-Harawī] said: I found that this statement belongs to Abū Manṣūr al-Albānī al-Bustī who said: I saw Yahyā b. ‘Ammār reprimanding the people of *kalām* on the pulpit [so frequently] that I could not count the times.” In reality, however, al-Harawī says in his DhK: “I saw Yahyā b. ‘Ammār on many occasions, one of which was on his pulpit anathematizing and cursing the *Mutakallimūn*, as well as testifying the heresy of Abū al-Hasan al-Ash‘arī.”⁶⁵⁴ As the result of this abridgement, al-Suyūtī succeeded in presenting al-Harawī’s arguments against the *Mutakallimūn* more comprehensible and more penetrating.

The Image of the History of the Opposition to *Kalām* Contained in DhK as abridged by al-Suyūtī in SM

Upon reading DhK as abridged in SM, one finds that the explicit view of al-Harawī is that the opposition to scholastic theology (*kalām*, *jadal*, *nazar* and *mara*) goes back to the earliest period of Islamic history. Enumerating a number of traditions, al-Harawī asserts that the opposition to *kalām* already started with the Prophet, who censured speculation (*kalām*) and the usage of the method of reasoning (*al-nazar*) as well as the use of critical questioning on some religious tenets, beliefs or practices. In a number of traditions with various chains of transmission, the Prophet, for instance, indicated that “the perishing of those before us happened because of their frequent questions and their arguments with their prophets.”⁶⁵⁵

According to al-Harawī, speculation is superfluous and thus should be regarded as an innovation, because God has revealed religion to the Prophet in a perfect way and completed His blessing through him. This is, al-Harawī argues, in

⁶⁵⁴Al-Harawī, *op. cit.*, p.280.

⁶⁵⁵“... innamā halaka man qablukum bikathrati suālīhim wa ‘htilāfihim ‘alā anbiyā’ihim.” Al-Harawī mentions some traditions pertaining to this question in his DhK, *op. cit.*, p.25.

line with the last words of God revealed to His Prophet: “Today I have perfected your religion for you.”⁶⁵⁶

What had been started by the Prophet with respect to the opposition to *kalām*, al-Harawī maintains, was obviously followed by his successors, whom he classifies into nine generations:

1. The First Generation: The Companions of the Prophet

Al-Harawī maintains that the Companions condemned those who question certain religious articles. ‘Umar b. al-Hattāb, for instance, had lashed Ṣabīg al-Kūfī because of a question concerning a variant reading (*harf*) of the Koran until the blood gushed from his back. On another occasion, ‘Umar also said: “Your discussion is the worst while your speech is also the worst ...”⁶⁵⁷ Along the same line, ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, according to al-Harawī, warned people that “at the end of time, there will be a people whose speech and arguments are not known by the adherents of Islam. They are inviting the people to adhere to their message. If one meets them, one is to kill them.”⁶⁵⁸

Other Companions, such as Ibn ‘Abbās, ‘Ikrima, Mu‘āwiya, Ibn Mas‘ūd, Ubayy b. Ka‘b, Mujāhid, al-Nazzāl b. Sabarah, Mu‘ādh b. Jabal and Tāwūs, are said to have rejected *kalām* as well. Their criticism of *kalām* revolve around: (a) Speculation on certain verses of the Koran; those involved in it were considered to be people who argue about the religion of God;⁶⁵⁹ those who speculate on these verses were associated to the satans of the Sea-islands;⁶⁶⁰ (b) That those who subject His religion to *qiyās*, will stay in confusion forever, deviating from the right way and plunging into distortion;⁶⁶¹ (c) That God will make those who were engaged in dispute deaf and dumb;⁶⁶² (d) Ascribing ignorance to those who disseminate reports which are not in the Book of God;⁶⁶³ (e) The adherents of heresy are to be inflicted with an incurable disease, *etcetera*.⁶⁶⁴

2. The second generation: the forerunners of the jurists from among the followers

From this generation, al-Harawī records the statements against *kalām* by a number of prominent figures, the most prominent of whom is Ibn Ṭāwūs (d. 132/750).⁶⁶⁵ Al-Harawī, for instance, narrates the attitude of Ibn Ṭāwūs towards the Mu‘azilites. For this purpose, al-Harawī “followed from the strand of ‘Abd al-Rāziq [d. 211/827]⁶⁶⁶ who said that Mu‘ammar [d. 153/771]⁶⁶⁷ had related to us the

⁶⁵⁶ Al-mā’ida (V) : 5. Bell, I, 94.

⁶⁵⁷ See al-Suyūti’s discussion of al-Harawī’s narration of the censure against *kalām* by the Companions in his SM, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

⁶⁵⁸ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

⁶⁵⁹ Ibidem.

⁶⁶⁰ Ibidem.

⁶⁶¹ Ibidem.

⁶⁶² SM, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

⁶⁶³ Ibidem.

⁶⁶⁴ Ibidem.

⁶⁶⁵ His complete name is ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṭāwūs b. Kaysān al-Yamānī. He died in 132/750. See al-Lālaka’ī, *op. cit.*, p. 36, n. 2 (H). According to al-Nashshār, his real name was Dhakwān; Ṭāwūs was his *laqab*. See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 88, n.1 (N).

⁶⁶⁶ ‘Abd al-Rāziq al- San‘ānī died in 211/827. See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 91, n.3 (N).

⁶⁶⁷ Mu‘ammar b. Rāshid died in 153/771. SM, 91, 4.

words: Ibn Ṭāwūs sat down. A man from the Mu'tazilites then came and started to argue [about religious matters]. So, Ibn Ṭāwūs inserted his fingers into his ears and said to his son: O, my son! Insert your fingers into your ears! close them up and do not listen to anything in his speech. Mu'ammar said: This means that the heart is weak. 'Abd al-Rāziq said - Ibrāhīm b. Yahyā' said to me: I see that the Mu'tazilites among your group are numerous. He replied: I said: yes. So, they think that you are one of them. He said: Would you please enter this shop with me so that I can speak to you. I replied: No. [He said: why?].⁶⁶⁸ I replied: Because the heart is weak and my religion is not for someone who is subdued."⁶⁶⁹

3. The Third Generation

Al-Harawī enumerates the censures of *kalām* by a number of personalities, the most prominent among whom was 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Azīz (d. 101/719-20),⁶⁷⁰ who was regarded by al-Suyūṭī as the *mujaddid* of 1st/7th century.⁶⁷¹ For this purpose, al-Harawī records a number of narrations based on the authority of 'Umar.

To begin with, he (viz. al-Harawī) took "from Abū al-Ṣalt Shihāb b. Ḥurāsh [d. ca. 200/816]"⁶⁷² the words: 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz sent a letter to a man, which read: Peace be upon you, to start with, I advise you to fear God, to observe his command, to follow the Sunna of His Messenger - may God bless him and grant him peace - and to abandon what the innovators innovated later on. His Sunna has been established to save them the trouble to look for anything else... Therefore, you have to observe the Sunna which constitutes, by the Will of God, a shield for you."⁶⁷³

Furthermore, al-Harawī narrates that 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz sent a letter to his son, 'Abd al-Malik, saying: "Let your knowledge be that of God who has sent it down on His prophet! Through it He indicated the things He loves and reprimands. He also informed the people by means of it about His command. He called them to His Book and guided them into His blessing. By it, He protected them from His punishment. By it, He obliged Himself to please them. Due to it, He placed them in the most virtuous place among His creatures. This is the knowledge, through which, one will not be ignorant; and by being ignorant of which, one will not be knowledgeable. Give it preference beyond anything else! Refrain from observing his prohibitions. That is necessary for one who knows it and [also for one who pursues] to obey God in accordance with what he was exhorted."⁶⁷⁴ That is the light of God which was revealed and by which the saints

⁶⁶⁸This is taken from the MS of the Damascus DK (fol. 86b).

⁶⁶⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

⁶⁷⁰The Umayyad caliph 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Aziz (d. 101/719-20), the *mujaddid* of the second century of *Hijra*, was considered by Juynboll as the first who singled out the *sunna* of the Prophet from the *sunnas* of others. See G.H.A. Juynboll, "Sunna" in EI², IX, 878-881; Cf. W.B. Hallaq, "Was the Gate of Ijtihad Closed?" in IJMES, 16 (1984), 3-41.

⁶⁷¹Al-Suyūṭī, *al-Taḥadduth*, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

⁶⁷²Abū al-Ṣalt Shihāb b. Ḥurāsh b. Ḥūshab al-Shaybānī al-Wasaṭī died ca. 200/816. See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 93, n.3 (N).

⁶⁷³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 93-4.

⁶⁷⁴The copying error also occurs here. The phrase in the MS of the Damascus DK (fol. 90b) reads *fa inna dhālikā yuhiqqu 'alā man 'alimah wa'ttaba'a tā'at-llāh fima ūsiya bih*. Whereas in SM, the phrase reads "*fa inna dhālikā yuhiqqu 'alā man 'alimah wa attabi'u*

of God are also guided. Whoever has no portion of it, does not benefit anything from it. He will remain in the darkness for the rest of his life in his present world.”⁶⁷⁵

Al-Harawī also quotes ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’s words: “If you hear arguing, neglect it.”⁶⁷⁶

4. The Fourth Generation

Al-Harawī lists a number of persons included in this generation. One of them to be mentioned here is Mālik b. Anas (d. 179/796).⁶⁷⁷ According to al-Harawī, Mālik b. Anas said: “Beware of the innovations! It was said: O, Abū ‘Abd Allāh, what are the innovations?” He replied: ‘The people of the innovations who speak about the names of God, His attributes, His speech, His knowledge and His will. They are not silent about a thing on which the Companions and the followers to whom belong the beneficence were silent.’”

He also takes from Mālik the words: “Whoever seeks for the religious truth with the help of *kalām*, becomes a heretic.” In the same line, al-Harawī refers to ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī (d. 117/736)⁶⁷⁸ as having said: “I came to see Mālik. He was with a man who asked him about the Koran. He answered: You might be one of ‘Amr b. ‘Ubayd’s friends. God has cursed ‘Amr, because he made these innovations of *kalām*. If *kalām* was knowledge, the Companions and the Followers must have made use of it, as also they have done in the laws and the religious rules. But [*kalām*] is a falsity which indicates falsity.”

He then quotes Mālik as having said: “Tradition decreased among the people only when the heresies arose among them. The number of learned men also decreased after the aversion arose among the people.” He also based upon Mālik the words: “Tradition is like Noah’s ship, he who gets aboard, is safe and he who holds back from it, drowns.” Finally he also transmitted from Mālik the words: “Every person coming to me who interprets the Book of God while being ignorant of the languages of the Arabs, is given a warning by me.”⁶⁷⁹

5. The Fifth Generation

A number of persons considered to have opposed *kalām* are included by al-Harawī in the fifth generation: One of them is Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767).⁶⁸⁰ Al-

tā’at-llāh fima uṣā’ bih.” The pronoun I used in SM, in this regard, however is not congruent with the context of the discussion in this passage.

⁶⁷⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

⁶⁷⁶Ibidem.

⁶⁷⁷Mālik’s full name was Abū ‘Abd Allāh Mālik b. Anas b. Mālik b. Abī ‘Amīr b. ‘Amr b. al-Ḥārith b. Gaymān b. Ḥuthayn b. ‘Amr b. al-Ḥārith al-Asbahī. He was an *imām* of *dār al-hijra* (Madīna), where the school of the Malikite was located. He wrote a number of works, the chief among which is *al-Muwatta*. He was born in 90-97/708-16 in Madina and died 179/796. See al-Lālakā’ī, *op. cit.*, p. 34, n.7 (H); Cf. J. Schacht’s “Mālik b. Anas” in EI², VI, 262-5.

⁶⁷⁸‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī b. Ḥassān al-Ḥanbalī Abū Sa‘id al-Baṣrī died in 117/736. See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 96, n.3 (N).

⁶⁷⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

⁶⁸⁰Abū Ḥanīfa al-Nu‘mān b. Thābit was a theologian and a religious lawyer, the eponym of the school of the Ḥanafis. He was born in 80/699 and died in 150/767. See J. Schacht, “Abū Ḥanīfa al-Nu‘mān,” in EI², I, 123-4.

Harawī quotes Nūh al-Jāmī‘ (d. 173/790)⁶⁸¹ as having said: “I said to Abū Ḥanifa: What is your opinion on *kalām* with respect to the accidents⁶⁸² and the bodies,⁶⁸³ which people innovated? He replied: [Those are] the concepts of the philosophers. You have to follow the tradition and the way of the pious ancestors. Beware of any fabrication, because it amounts to an innovation.”⁶⁸⁴

Al-Harawī narrates that when Abū Ḥanifa was asked about *a’rad* (accidents) and *ajsām* (substances), he said that they both were the concern of philosophers. Abū Ḥanifa went on asserting that one is to follow the tradition and in the footsteps of the ancestors and ought to beware of any innovation. Accordingly, in the words of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, Abū Ḥanifa prohibited people from studying *kalām*. Abū Yūsuf al-Qādī (d. 182/798) put forth the same censure as Abū Ḥanifa. The former narrated that one who seeks for religion by use of *kalām*, becomes an atheist and that knowledge of dispute and *kalām* is ignorance.⁶⁸⁵ Ibn al-Mubārak’s (d. 181/798)⁶⁸⁶ criticism of *kalām* was rather soft. He associated dispute to the Mu‘tazilites, lying to the Rafidites⁶⁸⁷ and religion to the scholars of tradition.⁶⁸⁸ ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī held the same opinion as the preceding two scholars mentioned. He stated that *kalām* leads the person immersed in it to atheism. In line with the idea of the scholars mentioned above, Talha b. ‘Amr (d. 152/770)⁶⁸⁹ held that one was not to dispute heretics, because they had a madness

⁶⁸¹Nūh’s full name was Nūh al-Jāmī‘ b. Abī Maryam; his *kunya* was Abū ‘Iṣmah al-Marwazī al-Qurashī. He was also called *al-Jāmī‘*, because of his expertise in many forms of knowledge. He died in 173/790. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 99, n.7 (N).

⁶⁸²Most of the Historians of Muslim philosophy and theology are of the opinion that ‘*arad* (pl. *a’rād*) originated from an Aristotelian term, which is mostly translated into English as ‘accident.’ This term is always defined, according to Rahman, as that which cannot subsist by itself but only in a substance of which it is both the opposite and the complement. See Rahman, F., “‘Araḍ,” in EI², I, 603.

⁶⁸³*Jism* (pl. *ajsām*), a term sometimes rendered in English as ‘body’ and sometimes as ‘substance’ was the term about which the opinions of the Muslim theologians, according to al-Ash‘arī, differs. Dirār b. ‘Amr is of the opinion that “*al-jism a’rād ullifat wa jumi’at faqāmat wa thubitat fāṣarat jisman yaqtamil al-a’rād idhā ḥalla wa al-tagyīr min hāl ilā hāl wa tilk al-a’rād hiya mālā tablū al-ajsām minh aw min diddih nāhw al-ḥayāt wa ‘l-mawt al-ladhāni la yahlū al-jism min wāhid minhumā,” whereas Mu‘ammār said that *al-jism* “*huwa al-ṭawīl al-‘arīd al-‘amīq...*” Al-Ash‘arī then recorded more than twelve different opinions on *jism*. See al-Ash‘arī, al-Imām Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Ismā‘īl, *Kitāb Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn wa Iḥtilāf al-Muṣallīn* (Istanbul: Matba‘at al-Dawla, 1929) ed. H. Ritter, p. 227; 301-6, 2 vols.*

⁶⁸⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 99-100.

⁶⁸⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

⁶⁸⁶Ibn al-Mubārak was ‘Abd Allāh al-Marwazī to whom al-Nashshār referred as ‘ālim ḥurāṣān wa muḥaddithuhā. He was originally Turkish died in 181/798. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 100, n. 2 (N).

⁶⁸⁷According to Kohlberg, the Rafidites are the members of the theological denomination, which points to the Proto-Imāmiyya (consequently the Twelver Shi‘a) and also to any members of Shi‘a sects. Al-Ash‘arī, he maintains, identified these groups with those who had by the 3rd/9th century adopted Mu‘tazilites ideas about God’s unity and about the createdness of the Koran. See Kohlberg, E., “al-Rāfiḍa”, in EI², VIII, 386-9.

⁶⁸⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

⁶⁸⁹Talha b. ‘Amr b. Uthmān al-Hadramī al-Makkī died in 152/. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 101, n. 3 (N).

like that of the scabby camel.⁶⁹⁰ Al-Fuḍayl b. ‘Iyād exhorted that one is not to sit beside a heretic, because that will bring about God’s wrath. In the same line, he held that the author of an innovation will not smell the fragrance of Paradise. The last censure of *kalām* of the scholars of the fifth generation is that of Ḥālid b. al-Ḥārith al-Hujaymī (d. 186/803).⁶⁹¹ He stated that the worst people are those who dispute and altercation.⁶⁹²

6. The Sixth Generation

One of the personalities mentioned by al-Harawī in this generation is Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfi‘ī. Al-Harawī’s discussion of al-Shāfi‘ī’s statements against *kalām* is quoted extensively by al-Suyūṭī in his SM, this is due to the fact that al-Suyūṭī, as discussed before, regarded al-Shāfi‘ī as the first to condemn logic and *kalām* explicitly. Here I quote al-Suyūṭī’s reference to al-Shāfi‘ī’s remarks against *kalām* in his SM *verbatim*:

He [viz. Al-Harawī] then adduced al-Karābī’s words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī said: ‘Everyone speaking about the Book and the Sunna is serious and speaking about anything other than that is nonsensical.’” He then transmitted from Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A’lā’ the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī said: ‘It is not said concerning the sources [the Koran and Sunna], why and how. In that respect, one rather has to submit.’” He then adduced the words of Abu ’l-Qāsim ‘Uthmān b. Sa‘id al-Anmātī who said: “I heard that al-Muzanī⁶⁹³ said: ‘I used to be involved in *kalām* before the arrival of al-Shāfi‘ī. When he arrived, I came to him and asked him a question related to *kalām*.’ He then asked me: ‘Do you know where you are now?’ I replied: ‘Sure, I am in the Grand Mosque (*al-Masjid al-Jāmi‘*) in Fustāt.’⁶⁹⁴ He then said to him⁶⁹⁵: ‘No, you are in Tārān.’⁶⁹⁶ Abu ’l-Qāsim said: ‘Tārān is a place in the Red Sea (*bahr al-qulzum*)⁶⁹⁷ from which hardly a single ship is safe.’ He then posed a question of jurisprudence. And I responded to it. He then put forth something to demolish my answer. So I replied with another thing. He proposed again something demolishing my answer. So when I started to answer with something to demolish his answer, he said to me: ‘This is jurisprudence which involves the Book and the Tradition. [The demolishing is only related to] the opinions of the people. So

⁶⁹⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

⁶⁹¹Ḥālid b. al-Ḥārith b. ‘Ubayd al-Hujaymī Abū ‘Uthmān al-Baṣrī died in 186/803. See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 102, n. 2. (N).

⁶⁹²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

⁶⁹³Ismā‘il b. Yahyā’ al-Muzanī died in 264/879. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 103, n. 4 (N).

⁶⁹⁴Fustāt, old Cairo which was built firstly by the Muslim conquerors. It was located on the east bank of the Nile, alongside the Greco-coptic township of Babylon. See Jomier, J., “al-Fustāt,” in EI², II, 957-9.

⁶⁹⁵The copying error also occurs in this place. In SM, is “he then said to him”. But in the MS of the Damascus DK (fol. 113a), it is “he then said to me.”

⁶⁹⁶Tārān is an Island in the Red Sea, which is situated between Qulzum and Wa’ayla. The inhabitants of Tārān were called Banū Jaddān. They relied for their food much on the sea and lived in ships as their houses. According to al-Yaqūt, Tārān had a reputation for its being the dirtiest place in the Sea of Qulzum. *Jacuts*, *op. cit.*, vol. I, 811.

⁶⁹⁷According to al-Hamawī, *Bahr al-Qulzum* (the Red Sea) is the part of Indian oceans. Its eastern coast is Berber, while its northern one is Jemen. Another part of its coast stretches out to the city of Qulzum nearby Egypt. *Jacuts*, *op. cit.*, p. 503, vol. I.

how to speak about the Lord of the Universe, a mistake which can imply an infidelity' [From then on] I left *kalām* and turned towards jurisprudence."⁶⁹⁸

He then adduced the words from 'Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal the words: "I heard that Muḥammad b. Dāwud [d. 296/910]⁶⁹⁹ had said: 'In the time of al-Shāfi'i, nowhere was it recorded, related or even known that he [al-Shāfi'i] spoke about futilities while he detested the *Mutakallimūn* and the innovators.' "

He then adduced on the authority of 'Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal the words from his father: "Whenever al-Shāfi'i was convinced of the veracity of a report, he followed it. His best property was that he did not desire theology. His only concern was *fīqh*."

He then put forth from al-Muzanī that someone asked him about a matter related to *kalām*. He replied: "I detest this. I even prohibit it just as al-Shāfi'i did. I heard al-Shāfi'i saying: 'Mālik was asked about *kalām* and *al-tawḥīd*. So he answered: 'It is absurd for us to think of the fact that the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - taught his *Umma* the *istinjā*', but did not teach them *al-tawḥīd*. *Al-tawḥīd* is what the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - remarked: I was ordered to kill the people until they say there is no God but Allah. No blood and property could protect the truth of *al-tawḥīd*.' "

He then adduced from al-Karābīsī the words: "I saw al-Shāfi'i. Then Bishr al-Murīsī came to him. So he said to Bishr: 'Tell me what you are propagating! A crystal-clear book, postulated suppositions or established prophetic traditions concerning which you found from the ancestors both a study and a question?' Bishr replied: 'No, but I am not able to oppose [that view] whatsoever.' Al-Shāfi'i then said: 'You confirmed your own mistake.'⁷⁰⁰ So what is your position with respect to the discussion on jurisprudence and narratives (*ahbār*)? People would follow you and learn that?' He replied: 'We have (scanty) contributions (*nubadh*) to it!' When Bishr went away, al-Shāfi'i said: 'He will never succeed.' "⁷⁰¹

He then adduced from Abū Dāwud and Abū Thawr (d. 240/854)⁷⁰² the words: "We heard al-Shāfi'i saying: 'No one who was occupied with *kalām*, would succeed.' " He also adduced from al-Husayn b. Isma'il al-Muhammīlī (d. 330/943)⁷⁰³ the following words: "Al-Muzanī said: I asked al-Shāfi'i about a question related to *kalām*. He replied: Ask me about something of which I can say, when I make a

⁶⁹⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

⁶⁹⁹Muḥammad b. Dāwud b. al-Jarrāḥ Abū 'Abd Allāh died in 296/910. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 104, n. 2 (N).

⁷⁰⁰The copying error also occurs in this place. In the MS of the Damascus DK (fol. 113b), the phrase reads "... *aqrarta binafsik 'alā al-haṭa'*..." while in SM, it reads "... *aqrarta binafsik 'alā al-haṭa' fiḥ...*" SM, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁷⁰¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁷⁰²This probably refers to Abū Thawr Ibrāhīm b. Ḥālid b. Abī 'l-Yamān al-Kalbī who died in Bagdad in 240/854. Abū Thawr, according to Schacht, was a prominent jurisconsult and founder of a school of religious law. Due to his stay in Irak one generation after al-Shāfi'i, Abū Thawr, Schacht argues, "seems to have been influenced by al-Shāfi'i's methodological insistence on the authority of the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet, without, however, renouncing the use of *ra'y* as had been customary in the ancient schools of law." See Schacht, J., "Abū Thawr," in EI², I, 155.

⁷⁰³Al-Husayn b. Isma'il al-Muhammīlī al-Dibbī al-Bagdādī b. 'Abd Allāh died in 330/943. SM, SM, *op. cit.*, p. 105, n. 1 (N).

mistake in it: I made a mistake. Do not ask me about something of which, when I make a mistake, I say: I became an infidel.”

He then adduced the words from Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam (d. 286/900)⁷⁰⁴: “Al-Shāfi‘ī said to me: O, Muḥammad, if someone asks you about something related to *kalām*, do not respond to him. Because when he asks you about *diya*,⁷⁰⁵ and you reply: [that amounts to] one *dirham*⁷⁰⁶ or one *daniq*,⁷⁰⁷ he says: You made a mistake. But if someone asks you about something related to *kalām*, and you make a mistake, he says: ‘You became an infidel.’”

He then adduced from al-Rabi‘ b. Sulaymān (d. 270/884)⁷⁰⁸ the words: “I heard al-Shāfi‘ī saying: ‘The arguing on religious tenets makes the soul cruel and stirs up animosity.’” He also adduced from al-Rabi‘ the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī said to me: O, Rabi‘! Accept from me three matters: [first,] do not enter into discussion about the Companions of the Messenger of God - may God bless him and grant him peace, because the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - will be your opponent on the Day of Resurrection; [secondly,] do not occupy yourself with *kalām*, because I found that some *Mutakalimūn* are in a favour of *al-ta‘til*,⁷⁰⁹ and [thirdly] do not busy yourself with astrology, because it draws you to *al-ta‘til*.⁷¹⁰”

He then adduced from al-Muzanī the words: “The established view of al-Shāfi‘ī is abhorrence of the occupation with *kalām*.” He also adduced from al-Karābisī the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī was asked about something related to *kalām*. So he became angry. He then said: ‘Hafṣ al-Fard [d. 205/820]⁷¹¹ and his companions already asked about this [question] before. God abased them.’”⁷¹¹

⁷⁰⁴Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam b. A‘yan al-Miṣrī died in 286/900. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 105, n. 2 (N).

⁷⁰⁵According to Kinder, *diya* signifies blood money or money paid in compensation for life. This term originates from a verse of the Koran (*al-nisā’*: 92), which reads *diyatun musallamatun ilā ahlihā* (blood money is to be paid to his kin). This verse, Kinder maintains, lays down the law of accidental homicide for which the perpetrator must emancipate a slave or fast for two months and give *diya* to the victim’s family if the victim was a *mu’mín* or *dhimmi* (protected people). The amount of *diya* for a free male muslim is set at 100 camels. See Kinder, R., “Blood Money,” in *the Encyclopaedia of the Qurān* ed. Jane Dammen McAuliffe (Leiden-Boston-Köln: E. J. Brill, 2001), vol. I, p. 239.

⁷⁰⁶*Dirham* is a silver coin whose weight is six *dawāniq*. Lane, *op. cit.*, I, 876.

⁷⁰⁷*Dāniq* (pl. *dawāniq*) is the sixth part of a *dirham*. Lane, *op. cit.*, I, 920.

⁷⁰⁸Al-Rabi‘ b. Sulaymān b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Jabbār al-Murādī Abū Muḥammad al-Biṣrī died in 270/884. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 105, n. 3 (N).

⁷⁰⁹*Ta‘til*, divesting God of His attributes, according to Van Ess, is equivalent with *tanzīh*, “transcendentalism”, a term which is always combined with its opposite term *tashbīh*, “anthropomorphism.” *Ta‘til* and its derivative *mu‘attil* or *mu‘attila* (denoting a person or a group practising *ta‘til*) are used here in polemical language as a derogatory term for the adversaries of al-Rabi‘ b. Sulaymān, implying that he along with al-Shāfi‘ī form the group who practice *tashbīh*, and oppose those who practice *ta‘til*, the Mu‘tazilites. On *tashbīh wa I-tanzīh*, see Van Ess, Joseph, “al-Tashbih wa ‘l-Tanzih,” in EI², X, 341-4.

⁷¹⁰Hafṣ al-Fard was a great polemicist of the Murji‘ite denomination who wrote *Kitāb fi I-Mahlūq ‘alā Abī I-Hudhayl* against Abu ‘l-Hudhayl al-Allāf, who also composed the polemical works, *Kitāb al-Mahlūq ‘alā Hafṣ al-Fard* and *Kitāb ‘alā Dirār wa Jahm wa Abī Hanīfa wa Hafṣ fi I-Mahlūq*. For the study of jurisprudence, he enjoyed the supervision of Abū Yūsuf, a disciple of Abū Hanīfa. According to al-Suyūtī, for the study of theology he was a disciple of Bishr al-Murīsī the *Mutakallim* and much influenced by Dirār b. ‘Amr.

He then put forth from Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Ash‘arī, al-Shāfi‘ī’s friend, the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī said: ‘My established view on the *Mutakallimūn* is that their heads should be veiled by the whips and that they should be banished from the land.’” He also adduced from al-Karābīsī (d. ca. 245/860)⁷¹² the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī said: ‘My (legal) judgment on the *Mutakallimūn* is like ‘Umar’s on Ṣabīg.’” He further put forth the words from Ahmad b. Ḥālid al-Hallāl (d. 247/862)⁷¹³: “I heard that al-Shāfi‘ī had said: ‘I did not debate with someone, of whom I know that he clings continuously to innovation.’”

He also adduced from Abū Thawr, al-Karābīsī [d. ca. 245/860] and al-Za‘farānī [d. 260/875]⁷¹⁴ the words: “We heard that al-Shāfi‘ī had said: ‘My legal opinion on the people of *kalām* is that they should be beaten with date-stalks and be escorted on the camel which then could bring them around the clans and tribes while summoning the people that this is the consequence of neglecting the Koran and the Tradition, for being fascinated with *kalām*.’”

He then transmitted the words from al-Za‘farānī (d. 260/875): “I heard al-Shāfi‘ī saying: ‘I never debated with someone on *kalām*, except once. I asked God’s forgiveness for it.’” He also adduced from Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A‘la’: “I heard al-Shāfi‘ī saying: ‘If you hear that someone says that the name is not identical to the object [named], be sure that he is a heretic!’” He also took from al-Rabī‘ the words: “I heard al-Shāfi‘ī saying in *Kitāb al-Wasāya*: ‘If someone bequeathes his books of knowledge to other people, while among them are theological books, those theological books should not be included in the *wāsiyya*, because [*kalām*] is not regarded as knowledge.’” He also adduced from al-Muzanī: “I heard al-Shāfi‘ī saying: ‘*Kalām* curses the *Mutakallimūn*.’”

He then adduced from al-Rabī‘[the words]: “I heard al-Shāfi‘ī getting off the stairs, while people were discussing theological [questions.] So he shouted at them saying: ‘Be our friendly neighbours, or stay away from us!’”⁷¹⁵

He also adduced the words from Abū Thawr (d. 240/854): “I said to al-Shāfi‘ī: ‘Write something on *kalām*.’ So he replied: ‘whoever is occupied with *kalām*, will never succeed.’” He then adduced from al-Za‘farānī the words: “Al-Shāfi‘ī used to detest *kalām* and to stay far from it.” He also adduced from al-Rabī‘ the words: “One day al-Shāfi‘ī came to us, while in the house there were people discussing something related to *kalām*. So he said: ‘Be our friendly

When he was in Baṣra, he became a disciple of Abu ‘l-Ash‘ath the Philosopher. Among his opponents, he was often called Ḥafṣ al-Qird, Ḥafṣ the Monkey. Al-Shāfi‘ī sometimes called him Ḥafṣ al-Munfarid, the Lonely Ḥafṣ or Ḥafṣ the Single fighter. He died in Egypt in 205/820. Van Ess, TG, *op. cit.*, II, 729-735.

⁷¹²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

⁷¹³Al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Ali b. Yazīd al-Bagdādī al-Karābīsī was referred to by al-Dhahabī as *Faqīh Bagdād* who studied jurisprudence under Imām al-Shāfi‘ī. He was the author of many works. He died in ca. 245/860. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XII, 79-82.

⁷¹⁴Aḥmad b. Ḥālid al-Hallāl Abū al-Bagdādī died in 247/862. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 106, n. 1 (N).

⁷¹⁵Al-Imām al-‘Allāma Shayh al-Fuqahā’ wa ‘l-Muḥaddithīn Abū ‘Ali, al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Ṣabbāḥ al-Bagdādī al-Za‘farānī was born in 170/787. He studied under the supervision of al-Shāfi‘ī, Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna, Abū Mu‘āwiya al-Darīr, Ismā‘il b. ‘Ulāyya, etc. Many prominent scholars transmitted prophetic tradition on his authority: al-Buḥārī, Abū Dāwud, al-Tirmidhī, al-Nasa’ī, al-Qazwīnī, etc. He died. in Bagdad in 260/875 . Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XII, 262-5.

⁷¹⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

neighbours, or stay away from us!' " He also adduced from al-Muzanī the words: "Al-Shāfi‘ī used to forbid one to enter into discussion concerning *kalām*." He then adduced from Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Hakam the words: "I heard al-Shāfi‘ī saying: 'If people know what *kalām* comprises, they will certainly flee from it, just as they flee from a lion.' " He also adduced from Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A‘lā' (d. 264/877)⁷¹⁶ the words: "Al-Shāfi‘ī's mother said: 'He refused that Ḥafs al-Fard sits with him.' " Al-Sajī said: "She always accompanied him. He took her everywhere with him."⁷¹⁷ He also adduced from al-Shāfi‘ī the words: "Al-Murīsī's mother said to me: 'Advise Bishr to avoid *kalām*! So I advised him. But he invited me to *kalām*.'"⁷¹⁸

He then adduced from al-Rabī‘ the words: "Someone asked al-Shāfi‘ī [who then said] that this [matter] leads to *kalām*. We will not answer a question related to *kalām*."⁷¹⁹

He then transmitted from Ibn Ḥuzayma: "I heard Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A‘lā' saying that al-Shāfi‘ī said: 'Any affliction by God, except *al-shirk*, is better for man than being afflicted by Him with *kalām*.' " He also adduced from al-Rabī‘ the words: "Al-Shāfi‘ī said to me: 'If I wanted to compose a big book against any adversary, I would have done it. But *kalām* is not my interest. I do not want to be associated with it, as well.' "

He then adduced from al-Za‘farānī [d. 260/875] the words: "Al-Shāfi‘ī used to wear a big turban as if he was a desert dweller (*a‘rābī*), while his hand held a cane. He had the sharpest tongue among the people. If speculation (*kalām*) was being practiced in his circle, he prohibited it. He would then say: 'We are not practitioners of *kalām*.' "⁷²⁰

He then adduced from Abū Ḥātim⁷²¹ the words: "Some of al-Shāfi‘ī's companions said: Al-Shāfi‘ī attended [a circle held] in the Grand Mosque.⁷²² Then someone debated with him on a question. The debate lasted very long. The man brought up a question related to *kalām*. Finally, al-Shāfi‘ī said to him: Leave this! Because it is related to *kalām*." He also adduced from al-Rabī‘ the words: "Al-Shāfi‘ī recited a poem to us censuring *kalām*:

The people go on fabricating innovations# in religious [matters] with their own opinions
with which the messengers were not sent
Until, most of them hold God's religion in low esteem#

⁷¹⁶According to Bosworth, Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A‘lā was "the leading Egyptian *muḥaddith* and authority on the *kirā’at*." See Bosworth, C.E., "al-Tabarī," in EI², X, p. 11.

⁷¹⁷This sentence is taken from "wakānat ma‘ah yaḥmiluhā ilā kull mawḍu‘" of the MS of the Damascus DK (fol. 116a). In SM, this sentence reads "wa kānat takūnu ma‘ahū yaḥmiluhā ma‘ahū ilā kull mawḍu‘." SM, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

⁷¹⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

⁷¹⁹Ibidem.

⁷²⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 107

⁷²¹Muḥammad b. Idrīs b. al-Mundhir al-Ḥanẓalī Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī was referred to by al-Dhahabī as *shayḥ al-muḥaddithīn*, who was one of the contemporaries of al-Buhārī. Among his disciples were Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A‘lā, his son, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Ḥātim, al-Rabī‘ b. Sulaymān, Abū Zur‘ā al-Rāzī, Abū Zur‘ā al-Dimashqī, etc. He died in 277/891. See al-Dhahabī, SAN, XIII, 247-263; SM, *op. cit.*, p. 107, n. 1 (N).

⁷²²The copying error also occurs in this place. In SM, this phrase reads "al-Shāfi‘ī attended (*hadara al-shāfi‘ī*)", whereas in the MS of the Damascus DK (fol. 116b), the phrase reads "I invited al-Shāfi‘ī (*haddartu al-Shāfi‘ī*).

But it deserves more engagement to be involved in [the matters of] the ancestors”⁷²³

This is all of what al-Harawī narrated with chains of transmission from al-Shāfi‘ī’s texts. Most of these [quotations] are adduced in the *manāqib* of al-Shāfi‘ī by Ibn Abī Ḥātim, al-Sājī and al-Bayhaqī.⁷²⁴

7. The Seventh Generation

The censures and the attitudes toward *kalām* of the people of this generation are described by al-Harawī in the following narratives. When Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Būshanjī⁷²⁵ was asked about *al-īmān* (the faith), he said that it is obligatory for all scholars and *ahl al-Islām* to follow the Koran and the *Sunna*, as well as to consider the foundations (*al-uṣūl*) laid down by the Koran and the *Sunna* as the aims of their intellects. In other words, they are not to consider their intellects as the aims of the foundations laid down by the Koran and the *Sunna*.⁷²⁶ Illustrating his words, al-Būshanjī narrated what ‘Umar b. al-Ḥaṭṭāb did to Ṣabīg and ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib to ‘Abd Allāh b. Saba’.⁷²⁷

Accordingly, Ayyūb al-Saḥtiyānī⁷²⁸ said that one is not to dispute with people about a matter one does not know, because that leads one to corruption.⁷²⁹ Justifying his censure of *kalām*, Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A’lā repeated al-Shāfi‘ī’s opinion that there is no sin worse than infidelity, except that of one who is engaged in *kalām*. For the same purpose, he goes on narrating that al-Layth b. Sa’id used to say: “If one sees one of the *ahl al-kalām* walking on water, do not trust him.” Concluding his words, Yūnus quoted al-Shāfi‘ī’s attitude towards the *mutakallimūn*, namely they should be hit on the head with palm-stalks and expelled to their homelands.⁷³⁰

In the same line, al-Harawī adduced from ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Ḥātim (d. 327/940)⁷³¹ the statement that the latter’s father (viz. Abū Ḥātim) and Abū Zur‘ā

⁷²³The last verse is taken from DhK, *op. cit.*, p. 256 which reads: “*wa fi lladhī halaw min haqqihi shuglun*.”

⁷²⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

⁷²⁵Al-Būshanjī, the author of *Mas’alat al-Taslīm li Amri ’llāh wa ’l-Nahy ‘an al-Duhūl fi Kayfiyyatih*, according to al-Suyūtī, was one of the leading Shāfi‘īte scholars, who was referred to by Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī as *shayḥ ahl al-hadīth fī zamānih*. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

⁷²⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

⁷²⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

⁷²⁸Abū Bakr b. Abī Tamīma Kaysān al-Baṣrī, Ayyūb al-Saḥtiyānī was described variously as *ahad al-a’lām min nujabā’ al-mawālī, sayyid al-fuqahā’, sayyid shabbāb ahl al-basra, jahbadh al-‘ulamā’*, etc. He learned (*samī‘a*) traditions from ‘Amr b. Salma al-Jarmī, Abu ’l-‘Āliya, Sa’id b. Jubayr, ‘Abd Allāh b. Shaqīq, Abū Qulāba, al-Hasan al-Baṣrī, Mujāhid, Ibn Sīrīn, etc. The most prominent among those who transmitted traditions on his authority were Sha’ba, al-Ḥamadān, Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna, Mu’ammār, Mu’tamīr, Ibn ‘Aliyya, ‘Abd al-Wārith, etc. He died in 131/750 in Baṣra. Al-Dhahabī, TI, juz. 5, p. 228-30.

⁷²⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

⁷³⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

⁷³¹He was a son of the celebrated *muḥaddith*, Abū Ḥātim. He was referred to by al-Dhahabī as *al-‘allāma al-ḥāfiẓ*. His *kunya* was Abū Muḥammad who was born in 240/855. He studied under the supervision of his father, Abū Ḥātim, Abī Sa’id al-Ashaj, al-Zāfarānī, Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-A’lā, al-Hasan b. ‘Arafa, etc. He died in 327/940. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XIII, 263-9.

(d. ca. 264/879)⁷³² refrained from befriending the *Mutakallimūn* and to study their writings. In al-Harawi's words, both of them said that the author of *kalām* will never be happy. They both refused to compose works based on reason without relying on *athār* and tried to urge people to shun the one who is engaged in it.⁷³³

One is able to find a mild censure of *kalām* in al-Zujjāj al-Nahwī's words. He stated that one who spends his life engaged in disputes, will find no convenient shelter.⁷³⁴ Accordingly, al-Haytham b. Kulayb (d. 335/947)⁷³⁵ quoted a poem of Qutaybī stating: "Leave alone one engaged in it."⁷³⁶ A warning against *kalām* can be found in the words of Ja'far al-Fargānī (d. 317/930).⁷³⁷ He stated that the least danger of theology, is the disappearance of the fear of God. Yet, if the heart is empty of the fear of God, that means that it is empty of the faith, as well.⁷³⁸

Other censures of *kalām* can also be found in the words of Sahl b. 'Abd Allāh (d. 283/896).⁷³⁹ Interpreting the verse: "wa ta'āwanū 'ala 'l-birri wa 'l-taqwā' walā' ta'āwanū 'ala 'l-ithmi wa 'l-'udwān", Sahl associates *al-birr* (righteousness) and *al-taqwā'* (piety) with faith and the *Sunna*, and *al-ithm* (sin) and *al-'udwān* (rancour) with infidelity and innovation.⁷⁴⁰ Sahl's censure of *kalām* seems more vehement in his statements that if one shuns *al-zāhir* (explicit meaning) and proceeds to the allegorical meaning (*al-bāṭin*),⁷⁴¹ one converts, in fact, to *zandaqa* (atheism).⁷⁴²

⁷³² This name probably refers to 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Karīm b. Yazīd b. Farrūḥ, Abū Zur'a al-Rāzī, to whom al-Dhahabī refers as *sayyid al-huffāz* and *muḥaddith al-rayy*. He was born in ca. 200/810. He is said to have attended the circle of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and to have memorized two hundred thousand prophetic traditions. He died in ca. 264/879. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XIII, p. 65-85.

⁷³³ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

⁷³⁴ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

⁷³⁵ Al-Haytham b. Kulayb b. Surayj b. Ma'qil, Abū Sa'id al-Shāshī was referred to by al-Dhahabī as the *Hāfiẓ* who studied traditions under the supervision of 'Isā b. Aḥmad al-'Asqalānī al-Balḥī, Muhammad b. 'Isā al-Tirmidhī, etc. His disciples were Abū 'Abd Allāh b. Manda, 'Alī b. Aḥmad al-Hujā'i and Manṣūr b. Naṣr al-Kāgidī. He died in 335/947. Al-Dhahabī, TI, *Hawādīth wa Wafāyāt* 331-340 H. (1415/1994), p. 132-3.

⁷³⁶ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

⁷³⁷ Abū Ja'far al-Fargānī al-'Askarī al-Ḍarīr, Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd was a resident of Damascus who studied traditions under Abū Sa'id al-Ashajj, al-Ḥasan b. 'Arafa and 'Umar b. Shabba. Among those who transmitted tradition on his authority were Abū Ḥashim 'Abd al-Jabbār al-Mu'addib, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. al-Sunnī, Abū Aḥmad al-Ḥākim and Muhammad b. al-Muẓaffar. He died in 317/930. Al-Dhahabī, TI, *Hawādīth wa Wafāyāt* 311-320 H. (1415/1994), p. 548.

⁷³⁸ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

⁷³⁹ This refers to Abū Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Yūnus b. 'Īsa b. 'Abd Allāh b. Rafī' al-Tustarī, an influential Ṣūfī of medieval Islam who was born in 203/818 in Tustar, Hūzistān and died in Baṣra in 283/896. See Bowering, G., "Sahl al-Tustarī," in EI², VIII, p. 840-1.

⁷⁴⁰ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

⁷⁴¹ This is closely connected to what Ibn Kathīr refers to as batinite interpretation (esoteric or allegorical interpretation) of the Koran, which he suggests as Qarmatian interpretation (Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya wa'l-Nihāya*, VI, 92). Ivanov maintains that the term *bāṭin* (from *bātn*, "belly") means 'deduced' with the help of allegorical interpretation (*ta'wīl*). It leads to the doctrine that there is no *zāhir* without its corresponding *bāṭin* and *vice versa*. Thus, the knowledge of the *bāṭin* of each *zāhir*, to its full extent, formed an exclusive prerogative

A censure of *kalām* in a rather different tone can be found in the definition of innovation by Abū Ḥafṣ. When he was asked about innovation, he defined it as neglecting the laws, scorning the traditions and following personal opinion, as well as shunning of authority (*al-ittibā'*).⁷⁴³

Al-Harawī then turns to the censure of *kalām* by Abū ‘Alī al-Jūzajānī. In his words, when al-Jūzajānī was asked about the way in which the *Sunna* should be followed, he said that it means avoiding innovations, following the consensus of the first generation of Muslim scholars and remaining far from studies of *kalām* and from its scholars, as well as observing the way of *al-iqtidā'* and *al-ittibā'*.⁷⁴⁴

Al-Harawī also describes the censures of other people. *First*, according to ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Hātim, his father (viz. Abū Hātim) and Abū Zur‘a used to say: “He who seeks for religion through *kalām*, goes astray.” *Secondly*, when he was asked about the oneness of God, Abu ‘l-‘Abbas b. Surayj said that it is *shahāda*, bearing witness that there is no god but Allāh and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh. However, the witnessing to the Oneness of God by the people of falsehood involves engagement in accidents (*al-a‘rād*) and substances (*al-ajsām*). The Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - was sent to reject it. *Thirdly*, Ahmad b. Muḥammad has said that dispute for the cause of victory is preceded by a debate and disputation (*siyāh*), followed by an inclination to dominate others and concluded by hatred and anger.⁷⁴⁵ *Fourthly*, when Abū Bakr b. Biṣṭām asked Abū Bakr b. Sayyār about being engaged in *kalām*, he prohibited him to do so.⁷⁴⁶ *Fifthly*, Abū ‘Amr b. Maṭar (d. 360/972)⁷⁴⁷ said that when Ibn Ḥuzayma was asked about the names and the attributes in *kalām*, he said that it was an innovation in which the leading Muslim scholars and the founders of the schools such as Mālik, Sufyan, al-Awzā‘ī, al-Shāfi‘ī, Ahmad, Ishāq, Yahyā b. Yahyā, Ibn al-Mubārak, Muḥammad b. Yahyā, Abū Ḥanīfa, Muḥammad b. al-Hasan and Abū Yūsuf had not been engaged. They refused to have anything to do with it and led their friends to the Koran and the Sunna.⁷⁴⁸

8. The Eighth Generation

In this generation, al-Harawī describes an interesting narration on the authority of Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Hākim, who stated: “I heard Abū Zayd al-Faqīh al-Marwazī [d. 371/982]⁷⁴⁹ saying: I met Abu ‘l-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī [d. ca. 320/933]⁷⁵⁰ in Baṣra. I

of the *Imām*, as did therefore the privilege of conveying its *ta’wil*. Qualified theologians, or anyone, could only offer a *ta’wil* explanation with the authorisation and endorsement of the *Imām*. The principle of *ta’wil*, Ivanov goes on maintaining, was violently condemned by the orthodox as easily leading to possible abuse, and chaos in religion. See Ivanov, W., *Brief Survey of the Evolution of Isma‘ilism* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1952), p. 24-5.

⁷⁴²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

⁷⁴³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

⁷⁴⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

⁷⁴⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

⁷⁴⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

⁷⁴⁷Abū ‘Amr b. Maṭar, Muḥammad b. Ja‘far b. Muḥammad b. Maṭar al-Naysābūrī al-Muzakkī was referred to by al-Dhahabī as *al-shayḥ al-imām al-qudwa al-‘āmil al-muḥaddith* and *shayḥ al-‘adāla*. He died in 360/972. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XVI, 162-3.

⁷⁴⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

⁷⁴⁹Abū Zayd Muḥammad b. Ahmad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Marwazī was referred to by al-Dhahabī as *al-shayḥ al-imām al-muftī al-qudwa al-zāhid* and *shayḥ al-shāfi‘iyya*.

learnt a bit of *kalām* from him. So I dreamt in my sleep that I was blind. I then related it [this dream] to an interpreter [of dreams]. He said: [This happened] because you acquired knowledge due to which you are led astray. Hence, I refrained from seeing al-Ash‘arī. He then saw me in the street and said to me: O ye Abu Zayd! Do you like to return to Ḥurāṣān while you are knowledgeable of the branches (*al-furū‘*) but ignorant of the roots (*al-uṣūl*). I then told him my dream. He said: Do not divulge it here!”⁷⁵¹

9. The Ninth Generation

In this generation, al-Harawī ascribes statements against *kalām* to a number of authorities. He refers, for instance, to Abū Manṣūr [al-Albānī] al-Bustī⁷⁵² as having said: “I saw Yaḥyā b. ‘Ammār [d. 422/1032]⁷⁵³ reprimanding the people of *kalām* on the pulpit [so frequently] that I could not count the times.” I also saw ‘Umar b. Ibrāhīm and our professors doing the same; [and]: I heard al-Ḥasan b. Abī Usāma al-Makkī [saying]: I heard my father saying: “God cursed Abū Dharr, i.e. ‘Abd b. Aḥmad al-Harawī [d. 434/1043].”⁷⁵⁴ Because he was the first who introduced *kalām* to al-Haram [viz. Mecca] and the one who spread it among the Maghribis.”

Al-Harawī also mentions that Manṣūr b. Ismā‘il⁷⁵⁵ had said: “I heard al-Ḥusayn b. Shu‘ayb [d. 432/1040]⁷⁵⁶ the jurist saying to Yaḥyā b. ‘Ammār: I heard Sālim saying: He who did not learn *kalām*, did not subject his religious belief to

He transmitted *sahīh al-buhārī* from the authority of al-Firabī. He also studied (*samī‘a*) tradition under Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Munkadīrī, Abu ’l-Abbās Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān al-Dagūlī, ‘Umar b. ‘Allak and Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Sa‘dī. Prominent disciples of his were Abū ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān al-Sulamī and Abu ’l-Ḥasan al-Dāraqutnī. He died in 371/982 in Merv. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XVI, 313-5.

⁷⁵⁰Abū ’l-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī was the Great Imām ‘Alī b. Ismā‘il b. Abī Bishr, the founder of the Ash‘arite theological school. He was born in 260/875 and died in Bagdad in ca. 320/933. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 119, n. 5 (N); see also Watt, W.M., “al-Ash‘arī, Abu ’l-Ḥasan,” in EI², I, p. 694-5.

⁷⁵¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 119-120.

⁷⁵²The copying error also occurs in this place. Abū Manṣūr al-Albānī al-Bustī (fol. 130b) is mistakenly copied as Abū Manṣūr al-Mālinī al-Bustī.

⁷⁵³Al-Imām al-Muḥaddith al-Wā’iz Yaḥyā b. ‘Ammār b. al-‘Anbas was referred to by al-Dhahabī as *shayḥ sijistān*, who studied under the supervision of Hāmid b. Muḥammad al-Raffā’, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Adī b. Ḥamduwayh al-Ṣabūnī, etc. The most prominent among his disciples was *Shayḥ al-Islām* Abū Ismā‘il ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Harawī. He died in 422/1032 in Herat. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XVII, 480.

⁷⁵⁴Abū Dharr was ‘Abd b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Gufayr b. Muḥammad al-Anṣārī al-Ḥurāṣānī al-Harawī al-Mālikī, known as Ibn al-Sammāk. He was regarded by al-Dhahabī as *al-hāfiẓ al-imām al-mujawwad al-allāma* and *shayḥ al-haram*. He was born in 356/968. He transmitted *sahīh al-buhārī* from al-Mustamlī, al-Ḥamawī and al-Kushmīhanī. Among his disciples were his son, Abū Maktūm ‘Isā, Mūsa b. ‘Alī al-Ṣaqalī, Abu ’l-Walid al-Bājī, etc. He was Malikite and Ash‘arite. He studied *kalām* under the supervision of al-Qādī Abū Bakr b. al-Tayyib. He died in 434/1043 in Mecca. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XVII, 554-561.

⁷⁵⁵Manṣūr b. Ismā‘il b. ‘Umar al-Tamīmī was well known as Abu ’l-Ḥasan. He died in 306/918. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 122, n. 4 (N).

⁷⁵⁶Al-Ḥusayn b. Shu‘ayb b. Muḥammad al-Sinjī died in 432/1040. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 122, n. 5 (N).

God. So I said: Did you inherit [something] from your father?" Likewise, al-Harawī refers to ‘Isā b. Muḥammad al-Anṣārī⁷⁵⁷ who had remarked: "I heard al-Ḥasan b. Ḥanī saying: 'All of us have learned *kalām*, but we became tongue-tied ('aqilnā). So we remained silent. Abu 'l-Jūdī⁷⁵⁸ and al-Dīnārī [d. 407/1017]⁷⁵⁹ became furious. So they both became chaste in speech.' "⁷⁶⁰

In another passages, al-Harawī also quotes Tāhir b. Muḥammad al-Albānī as having said: "I saw al-Dīnārī [d. 407/1017] being asked by Abū Sa‘d al-Zāhid to repent. I never saw him in such a baseness like on that day. I also knew that the seminar of Sālim in the Mosque was cleaned at the time of Yaḥya b. 'Ammār [d. 422/1032] and 'Umar b. Ibrāhīm [d. 425/1036]⁷⁶¹ on the basis of consultation. I heard Maṇṣūr b. Ismā'īl the jurist praising God for that account. Sālim then came repenting. So Yaḥya b. 'Ammār said to the chamberlain (*al-hājib*)⁷⁶²: Tell him to bring the books of *kalām* in order that we burn them in the fire. But he did not permit him [to do that]."⁷⁶³

[b.] *Al-Ri‘āya* by al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī (d.243/857-8)

Biography

Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥārith b. Asad al-Muḥāsibī was born in 165/783 into a family that lived in Basra. According to most of his biographers, the name of al-Muḥāsibī was given to him because of his habit of self-examination. However, this notion was rejected by 'Atṭār, Smith says, stating that it was due to the fact that he made no statement without previous reflection. His *nisba* of al-Anazī indicates his tribal affiliation to the Beduin tribe, Anaza.⁷⁶⁴

Al-Muḥāsibī was the son of a man who, according to Ibn Ḥallikān, professed the doctrine of man's free will.⁷⁶⁵ His father was considered a heretic and described variously as a Qadarite, Rafidite and a Magian.⁷⁶⁶ According to

⁷⁵⁷The copying error also occurs in this place. "‘Isā b. Muḥammad al-Anṣārī"(fol. 130b) is mistakenly copied as "‘Ali b. Muḥammad al-Anṣārī."

⁷⁵⁸Here the editor of SM, al-Nashshār seems to have misidentified Abu 'l-Jūdī al-Asadī the Shāfi‘īte, with al-Ḥārith b. 'Amīr who died ca. 100/719 (SM, *op. cit.*, p. 123, n. 2 (N)). All the figures cited by al-Harawī in this generation, including al-Jūdī were contemporaries, and some of them were even teachers, of al-Harawī.

⁷⁵⁹His complete name was 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. Hāmid Abu'l-Ḥasan al-Dīnārī al-Anṣārī al-Harawī. He died in 407/1017. Al-Dhahabī, TI, *Hawādīth wa Wafayāt* 401-410 H. (1415/1994), p. 527.

⁷⁶⁰SM, *op. cit.* p. 122-3.

⁷⁶¹Umar b. Ibrāhīm b. Ismā'īl, a cousin (*ḥāl*) of *Shaykh al-Islām* Abū 'Uthmān al-Ṣābūnī was referred to by al-Dhahabī as *al-hāfiẓ al-qudwā* and *al-zāhid*. Like Yaḥyā b. 'Ammār, he was also teacher of Abū Ismā'īl al-Harawī. He died in 425/1036. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XVII, p. 448-9.

⁷⁶²According to Sourdel, this term can be translated approximately as chamberlain. It is "used in Muslim countries for the person responsible for guarding the door of access to the ruler, so that only approved visitors may approach him." See Sourdel, D., "Hādjib," in EI², III, p. 45.

⁷⁶³SM, *op. cit.* p. 123.

⁷⁶⁴Al-Muḥāsibī, al-Ḥārith, *Kitāb al-Ri‘āya li Huqūq Allāh*, ed. Margareth Smith (London: Luzac & Co, 1941).

⁷⁶⁵Ibn Ḥallikān, *Biographical Dictionary*, V. I, 365-6, transl. By Bn. Mac Guckin De Slane (Paris: 1842)

⁷⁶⁶Smith, Margareth, in the introduction of *al-Ri‘āya*, p. xv.

most of al-Muḥāsibī's biographers, due to his father's heresy, al-Muḥāsibī refused to inherit seventy thousand dirhems from him, insisting that 'persons of different religions cannot inherit, one from the other.'⁷⁶⁷ According to al-Subkī, al-Muḥāsibī even asked his father to divorce his mother.⁷⁶⁸

That al-Hārith al-Muḥāsibī is stated to have been a student under Imām al-Shāfi‘ī is controversial among the biographers. According to al-Suyūtī, Abū Manṣūr al-Tamīmī had included al-Muḥāsibī in the first generation of the companions of al-Shāfi‘ī⁷⁶⁹ and considered him one of the followers of al-Shāfi‘ī. Abū Ḥāsim al-‘Ibadī, conversely, only considered him one of al-Shāfi‘ī's contemporaries. Al-‘Ibadī maintained that despite being one of the followers of the Shafi‘ite school, al-Muḥāsibī was not reported to have been one of those who met al-Shāfi‘ī.⁷⁷⁰

The authority of al-Muḥāsibī in a number of traditional sciences was recognized by most of his biographers. Ibn Ḥallikān considered him one of those who possessed both the science of the exterior and the science of the interior.⁷⁷¹ Al-Subkī, for instance, maintained that al-Muḥāsibī was a leading scholar in *taṣawwuf*, Tradition, *Kalām* and Jurisprudence. His writings, which were reported to have amounted to twenty-one, seventeen of which are known to be extant,⁷⁷² constitute authoritative sources for the scholars of Mysticism, Tradition, *Kalām* and Jurisprudence of the later generation. His authority was always referred to by most of the *Mutakallimi al-Ṣifātiyya*, the theologians on the Attributes of God.⁷⁷³ The most recognized authority of al-Muḥāsibī, however, lies in his sufistic teachings.⁷⁷⁴

Al-Muḥāsibī's speculative thoughts and his use of dialectics in support of his views aroused criticism from his contemporaries. According to his biographers, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal was reported to have banished al-Muḥāsibī's writings and prohibited people to read them. It was reported that *al-Hāfiẓ* Sa‘ad b. ‘Amr al-Barza‘ī saw Abū Zur‘a asked Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal about al-Muḥāsibī and his works. Abu Zur‘a was told to avoid al-Muḥāsibī's works because they were full of innovations.⁷⁷⁵

Although the blind reaction of the Sunnites against al-Muḥāsibī owes to their misunderstanding of his use of dialectical reasoning in opposing the Mu’tazila,⁷⁷⁶ the opposition of the Sunnites against al-Muḥāsibī and his eccentric thoughts, according to Arnaldez, however, seem to have been so ubiquitous that it forced him to live in exile in a small town far from Bagdad. That this opposition of his adversaries did not decrease was reflected in his burial ceremony. Most of his biographers reported that when he died in 243/857-8, only four persons attended his funeral.

⁷⁶⁷Ibn Ḥallikān, *op. cit.*, p. 365.

⁷⁶⁸Al-Subkī, TSK, II, 38.

⁷⁶⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

⁷⁷⁰Al-Subkī, TSK, II, 37.

⁷⁷¹Ibn Ḥallikān, *op. cit.* p. 365.

⁷⁷²Smith, *op. cit.*, p. xvi.

⁷⁷³Al-Subkī, TSK, II, 38.

⁷⁷⁴Smith, *ibidem*.

⁷⁷⁵Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān*, *op. cit.*, I, 174.

⁷⁷⁶Arnaldez, *op. cit.* p. 467.

Al-Muḥāsibī's masterpiece, *al-Ri'āya*

Al-Ri'āya has been edited several times, first of which by Margareth Smith (London: 1941) and then by 'Abd al-Qādir Aḥmad 'Aṭā (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 4th ed). According to Smith, al-Muḥāsibī has written twenty-one works representing his authoritative work in Juriprudence, Tradition, *tasawwuf* and *Kalām*. Of these only seventeen were known to be extant. Considered as al-Muḥāsibī's masterpiece, *al-Ri'āya*, however, was his most authoritative work on Mysticism. Written in the form of counsels, given to a disciple in reply to his questions, *al-Ri'āya* represented its author as willing to help the believers to find the way of life in which they could render to God the service which He is due.⁷⁷⁷

Al-Muḥāsibī's hostile attitude towards debate and argumentation is reflected in his discussion found on several pages in chapter LIX, which deals with self-delusion in relation to God.⁷⁷⁸ In this chapter, al-Muḥāsibī discusses the self-delusion of the people by debate and argumentation as well as by the refutation of the adherents of different religions. Then he classifies people deluded by debate and disputation into two main groups: *First*, those who are led astray and lead others astray. *Secondly*, those who save themselves by following the guidance and the sunna of the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace. In concluding his discussion, al-Muḥāsibī addresses his own attitude. He tells us how he prefers to follow guidance rather than being occupied with debate and argumentation. His after-life concerned him so much that he never allowed himself to be occupied with debate and disputation.

According to al-Muḥāsibī, the people who have been deluded by debate and disputation propose different ideas reflecting their course of life. The first category of people maintain that one will not act soundly until one has a sound belief. They also state that no one knows God better than they do. These people can be divided into two groups.

The first group are the ones who have been led astray and have led others astray. Al-Muḥāsibī identifies this group with a number of characteristics: (1) They are not aware of their being led astray due to their sophisticated expertise in argumentation and to their knowledge of complicated theological concepts as well as their apt arguments against their adversaries. (2) They refer to themselves as the ones who uphold the truth revealed by God, and as the ones who oppose all error (*dalāla*).⁷⁷⁹

Furthermore, al-Muḥāsibī identifies the second group with the following characteristics: (1) They are deluded by debate and skilful in argumentation. (2) They claim that they uphold the truth and do not follow anything else than it. (3) They are of the opinion that an idea can be regarded sound only if it is formulated through examination and reasoning. They spent their time being occupied with debate, far away from God's guidance, by which they become blind to their sins and mistakes.⁷⁸⁰

According to al-Suyūtī, al-Muḥāsibī suggests that this group of people are not free from making mistakes in their interpretation and conception. However,

⁷⁷⁷Smith, *op. cit.*, p. xvii.

⁷⁷⁸Al-Muḥāsibī, *al-Ri'āya*, *op. cit.*, p. 458-461; SM, *op. cit.*, p. 126-130.

⁷⁷⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 126-7.

⁷⁸⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

they deny being deluded by debate and argumentations, claiming that they are knowledgeable of the fact that the Koran has both clear and ambiguous verses. Al-Muḥāsibī then emphasizes their uncountable mistakes in interpretation (*ta’wīl*).⁷⁸¹

The second group of people who uphold the truth and who are deluded by debate and disputation, being far removed from God and from what is worthier, al-Muḥāsibī argues, negate their being deluded by argumentation. Although most of them are well-acquainted with heretics and the innovators, they do not spend their lives in dispute and do not make religion the subject of their disputation. They attempt to exercise self-reflection and prepare for the life in the Hereafter. They speak the truth and avoid committing mistakes against God. Therefore they refute one falsity with another one. They keep doing that.⁷⁸²

Demonstrating his real attitude against debate and argumentation, al-Muḥāsibī states that he does not feel secure to argue through allegorical interpretation (*ta’wīl*) and analogy. One may think that one’s arguing is a guidance (right way), whereas it is actually a falsehood and deviation. In another passage, al-Muḥāsibī explains that he used to argue, but since he came to know its danger, he gave up argumentation.⁷⁸³

Concluding his discussion against debate and argumentation, al-Muḥāsibī exhorts people not to be occupied with these things. Debating and arguing, al-Muḥāsibī suggests, make people forget about their life in the Hereafter. Once one is occupied with debate and argumentation, al-Muḥāsibī goes on arguing, one returns to God without having repented.⁷⁸⁴

Al-Muḥāsibī has devoted only one out of sixty-two chapters to his discussion on being deluded by debate and argumentation. A question to be raised here is why did al-Suyūṭī include al-Muḥāsibī in his list of the opponents of *kalām*? An answer that can be proposed immediately is that al-Suyūṭī regards al-Muḥāsibī as belonging to the first generation of followers of al-Shāfi‘ī and as a savant in several Islamic knowledges: “wa ‘l-hārith hādha qad ‘addahu ‘l-ustādh abū manṣūr al-tamīnī fī ‘l-ṭabaqa al-ūlā min aṣḥāb al-shāfi‘ī...imām al-muslimīn fī ‘l-fiqh wa ‘l-tasawwuf wa ‘l-hadīth wa ‘l-kalām wa ‘l-zuhd wa ‘l-wara‘ wa ‘l-ma‘rifā.”⁷⁸⁵ By incorporating al-Muḥāsibī on his lists against *kalām*, his adversaries may have been led to the impression that *kalām* had been opposed by many Shāfi‘ite savants, some of whom had even been occupied with *kalām* before and then repented, like al-Muḥāsibī.

Having compared *al-Rī‘āya* with the edition by ‘Abd al-Qādir Ahmād ‘Atā,⁷⁸⁶ it can be concluded that al-Suyūṭī did not abridge or paraphrase it. He rather incorporated it fully into his SM, presumably because of the fact that all the arguments of al-Muḥāsibī dealing with the censure of debate and contention are penetrating arguments without any digression whatsoever.

[c.] *Kitāb Ḥalq Afāl al-‘Ibād* (forthwith called: KH) of al-Buḥārī, the Author of *al-Ṣaḥīḥ* (d. 256/870)

⁷⁸¹Ibidem.

⁷⁸²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

⁷⁸³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

⁷⁸⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

⁷⁸⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

⁷⁸⁶Al-Rī‘āya, *op. cit.*, p. 458-461.

There could have been three reasons why al-Suyūṭī incorporated KH into SM: the first two are obvious, and the third is an assumption. *First*, the contents of al-Buhārī's KH explicitly condemns *kalām*. *Secondly*, there is the all-important fact that al-Buhārī was referred to by al-Suyūṭī as one of those who entitled to undertake *ijtihād*.⁷⁸⁷ *Thirdly*, the fact that al-Subkī has included al-Buhārī among the Shāfi'iite *fāqīhs*, in spite of the refutation of the affiliation of al-Buhārī to the Shāfi'iite law school by some modern scholars.⁷⁸⁸

This work was published for the first time in India in 1306/1889⁷⁸⁹ and was re-published in Cairo in 1988 in an edition of Abū Muḥammad Sālim b. ‘Abd al-Hādī al-Salafī *et al.*⁷⁹⁰

In his KH, al-Buhārī as a traditionist, provides a number of narrations censuring debate, argumentation and *kalām*: “He said in his work [KH]: What is known on the authority of Ahmād [b. Ḥanbal]⁷⁹¹ and the scholars is that they hate discussion and examination of obscure things. They also avoid the *Mutakallimūn*. They only discourse and dispute on a matter concerning which there is [traditionally established] knowledge [available], and which the Messenger - may God bless him and grant him peace - has explained. God the Almighty said: ‘And if ye quarrel about anything, refer it to Allah and the Messenger...’ ”⁷⁹²

Then he adduced the *hadīth*: “The Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - heard some people quarrelling. He said: ‘Those who were before you perished only because of this. They contrast certain verses of the Book of God with other ones. The Book of God was revealed only in order that certain verses of it justify other ones. Do not contrast certain verses with other ones. Whatever you know, say [it]; and what is difficult for you [to know], ask it from one who knows it.’”

He also adduced the *hadīth* of the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace: “Whatever you disagree on, refer it to God and to Muḥammad - may God bless him and grant him peace.”

He also adduced the tradition of ‘Ā’isha: “He who performs [a religious] practice to which our command does not point, [his reward] is denied.”

He [al-Buhārī] said: “‘Umar ordered that the ignorant should refer to the Book and the Tradition.’ Likewise, al-Buhārī said: “He who does not know that God’s *Kalām* is not created, he [should] know and avoid his ignorance by referring to the Book and the Tradition. He who rejects it [i.e. the uncreatedness of the Koran] after having known of it, is a transgressor.” God the Almighty said: “Allah is not one to lead a people astray after He has guided them until He makes clear to them what they should guard against...”⁷⁹³ He then said: “But he who

⁷⁸⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

⁷⁸⁸Robson, for instance, rejects the idea of al-Buhārī being affiliated to the Shāfi'iite law school, since the latter did not consistently subscribe to the doctrine of any particular school. See Robson, J., “al-Bukhārī,” in EI², I, 1296-7.

⁷⁸⁹Ed. by Shams al-Ḥaqqaq ‘Azīmābādī in Delhi. GAS, I, 133-4; SM, *op. cit.*, p. 131, no. 1(N).

⁷⁹⁰Published by Maktaba al-Turāth al-Islāmī.

⁷⁹¹This name “Ahmad” appears repeatedly in KH. This probably refers to Ahmād b. Ḥanbal, who vehemently refuted the createdness of the Koran, the discussion of which occupies several pages of KH.

⁷⁹²*Al-Nisā'a* (IV): 62. Bell, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 75.

⁷⁹³*Al-Tawba* (IX): 116. Bell., *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 188.

splits off from the Messenger after the Guidance has become clear to him, and follows any other way than that of the believers, We shall consign him to what he has turned to, and roast him in Gehenna- a bad place to go to!”⁷⁹⁴

Furthermore, al-Buhārī remarked: “whenever one is encountered with something ambiguous, he/she is to infer about [that matter] with one who knows it [well].” The tradition of Ibn ‘Amr says: “One is not to enter into discussion of the ambiguities, except of what is clear to him.” Finally, al-Buhārī then adduced the tradition of ‘Ā’isha concerning [the Prophet’s] saying: “If you see those who follow what is ambiguous, [you must know that] they are the ones who preoccupy God. So, beware of them!”⁷⁹⁵

Concerning the way al-Suyūtī deals with KH for his discussion against *kalām*, it can be said that he selected only some of the relevant discussions (viz. one and a half pages out of 180 printed pages).⁷⁹⁶

[d.] *Sarīh al-Sunna* (forthwith called: SS) of Ibn Jarīr al-Tabarī

Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Tabarī was born in Amul, the capital city of Tabāristān at the end of 224 or the beginning of 225/841. Like other scholars of the time, he specialized in three fields: history, legal theory and Qur’anic science. Besides, al-Tabarī was credited with exceptional learning in a variety of disciplines. He was well-versed in grammar, lexicography and philosophy. He was also well-acquainted with exact sciences and his great interest was medicine.⁷⁹⁷ According to Bosworth, he was mostly famous as “the supreme universal historian and the *Kurān* commentator of the first three or four centuries of Islam.”⁷⁹⁸ He died in 310/923.⁷⁹⁹

In spite of its shortness, al-Tabarī’s biographical information provided by al-Suyūtī in SM reveals the reason why al-Suyūtī incorporated data from SS: al-Tabarī was a *mujaddid* of the third Islamic century, whose biography was cited extensively in *Tabaqāt al-Mufassirīn*. Referring to al-Subkī in *al-Tabaqāt*, al-Suyūtī says that al-Tabarī was an independent *mujtahid*, who studied jurisprudence under the guidance of al-Shāfi‘ī and then under that of al-Ja‘farānī and al-Rabī‘ al-Murādī.⁸⁰⁰ Another relevant fact was of course that al-Tabarī was a fervent critic of the *Mutakallimūn*. This is confirmed by Gilliot, for instance, whose study of the influence of theological views on al-Tabari’s linguistic approach in his exegesis, lead him to suggest that although al-Tabarī has made use of certain arguments and methods of *kalām* in his exegesis,⁸⁰¹ he, as reflected in his works, shares the ideas upheld by other traditionalists, such as Ahmād b. Ḥanbal, al-

⁷⁹⁴ *Al-Nisā’* (IV): 115. Bell, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 84.

⁷⁹⁵ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 131-2.

⁷⁹⁶ KH, *op. cit.*, p. 61, 63.

⁷⁹⁷ GAL, I, 142, 184, S.I, 217; cf. Franz Rosenthal, *The History of al-Tabarī, General Introduction and from the Creation to the Flood*, translation and annotated by Franz Rosenthal, (New York: State University Press, 1989), vol. I, p. 5-126.

⁷⁹⁸ See Bosworth, C.E., “al-Tabarī,” in EI², X, p. 11-15.

⁷⁹⁹ Al-Suyūtī provides some biographical information about al-Tabarī in his introductory remark on *Kitāb Sarīh al-Sunna*, SM, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

⁸⁰⁰ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

⁸⁰¹ Claude Gilliot, *Exégèse, Langue et Théologie en Islam : l’Exégèse Coranique de Tabari* (Paris : Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1990), p. 9, 14.

Buhārī, al-Dārimī, etc.⁸⁰² Setting the position held by al-Tabarī in his exegesis, Gilliot further argues that the group which al-Tabarī attempted to attack was the one which strictly upheld qadarite theological views as well as the Jahmites.⁸⁰³

According to Rosenthal, SS was known as al-Tabarī's creed, in which he explains his theological views as well as religious theory and practice in the service of God.⁸⁰⁴ This work has been edited on the basis of the Istanbul manuscript and translated by D. Sourdel, "Une profession de Foi de l'Historien al-Tabari" in *Revue des Etudes Islamiques* XXXVI Fas. 2, 1968 in 7 printed pages.

In the work under discussion Al-Tabarī narrates some events that occurred after the death of the Prophet, such as the dispute among the *ummā* about who was most entitled to the leadership and the caliphate among them, the dispute on "the deeds of the worshippers, both their obedience and their violations; whether [the deeds of the worshippers] are determined by the *qadā'* of God and His *qadar* or the affair respecting this question is given to the people;" then follows the dispute on the Koran, viz. whether it was created or not, and on the Divine vision of the believers in the Day of Resurrection. Al-Tabarī considered all these disputes as stupidities which only occupied people of stupidity and enmity. Furthermore, he quotes Ahmad b. Hanbal as having said: "He who says that my pronounciation of the Koran is created, is a Jahmite; and he who says that the Koran is not created, is an innovator."

Concluding his discussion, he states: "Not a single saying in that respect is allowed to us to express except his saying: If we do not have a leader in [the discussion on the createdness of the Koran], we look for another person with whom [we are] pleased and satisfied. He is the leader to whom one adheres (*al-imām al-muttaba*). The discussion on the name: whether it stands for a thing or for nothing is one of the recent stupidities about which not a single tradition to be followed was transmitted. Neither has an opinion from an *imām* been transmitted. Thus, being occupied with [such a discussion] is a disgrace, whereas, being silent of it is a grace."⁸⁰⁵

Based on the comparison of Sourdel's edition of SS, which comprises 7 printed pages, and the SS incorporated into SM which consists of three and a half printed pages, two things are worthy of noting: *First*, it is obvious that Sourdel does not refer to SM when editing SS (in 1968), in spite of the fact that SM was edited much earlier (in 1947). However, a lacuna in Sourdel's edition of SS could have been filled in on the basis of SM.⁸⁰⁶ Likewise, some words in the text of SS in Sourdel's edition could have been corrected and rendered more comprehensible.⁸⁰⁷ *Secondly*, al-Suyūtī left some pages unabridged due to their

⁸⁰²"Nous avons déjà vu que Tabari avait eu maille à partir avec des hanbalites qui l'accusaient d'hérésie..." Gilliot, *op. cit.*, p. 208-210.

⁸⁰³"Tabari s'en prend surtout aux groupes d'obéissance qadarite." Gilliot, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

⁸⁰⁴Rosenthal, *op. cit.*, p. 125-6.

⁸⁰⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 136-7.

⁸⁰⁶A lacuna on p. 193, l. 6 of Sourdel's edition, where al-Tabarī says: "*al-hamdu lillah muflīḥ al-haqqa wa nāṣiruh...*," can be filled in with more than two pages of SS recorded in SM (p. 134-5). See Sourdel, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

⁸⁰⁷Just to give a brief example, in Sourdel's edition (p. 194 and 198), *hamaqāt* (stupidities) was rather copied as *jama'āt*. This can be clearly read, for instance in a phrase which reads: "*wa amma l-qawl fi l-isnāt ahuwa al-musammā am huwa gayr al-musammā fa-innahū mina*

being merely further explanations of major theological issues revolving around (1) the *imāma*, (2) the action of man in relation to God's ordinance, (3) the status of belief (*īmān*) whether it is determined by words (*qawl*) or action or by both of them, (4) the vision of God, (5) the createdness of the Koran and (6) the words of the Koran (*al-fāz al-qur'ān*).

[e.] *Al-Gunya 'an al-Kalām* of Abū Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Ḥaṭṭābī

At the end of the summary of *al-Gunya*, al-Suyūtī provides some biographical information about al-Ḥaṭṭābī. He was a leading scholar in the field of jurisprudence, language, etc. and died in 388/988.⁸⁰⁸ According to Günther, al-Ḥaṭṭābī was a Shāfi'i traditionalist who was born in 319/931 in Bust (now Lashkargāh), a city in Southern Afghanistan. Among his important teachers were Abū Sa'īd b. al-'Arabī (d. 341/952) and Ibn al-Najjad (d. 348/959) and one of his prominent disciples was the Shāfi'i Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfarā'inī (d. 406/1015-6) who was the teacher of al-Gazālī. Al-Ḥaṭṭābī was the author of nine works, six of which have been edited.⁸⁰⁹ According to Brockelmann, the way in which al-Ḥaṭṭābī used to discuss was very critical and argumentative.⁸¹⁰

Apart from the fact that it was quoted by Ibn Taymiyya in *Majmū'at al-Rasā'il al-Kubrā*,⁸¹¹ almost no information can be found about *al-Gunya*. When discussing al-Ḥaṭṭābī's opposition to the Ash'arite *kalām*, Günther, for instance, mentions only that it was written to anathematize *kalām*, without dealing with its content in spite of the fact that this work was incorporated into SM.⁸¹² Likewise, Makdisi suggests that "this work is not extant."⁸¹³

Al-Ḥaṭṭābī's censure of *kalām* is clearly stated in his remarks: "You have established your own opinion, my brother,⁸¹⁴ may God protect you in a fair manner. You have [also] portrayed your attitude to us with respect to the heretical views of the *Mutakallimūn*, to the occupation of those who are involved in vain discourse with [those heretical views], to the tendency of some followers of the *Sunna* towards them and their being deceived by them. [You are also well-informed of] their pretension that *kalām* is a protection for tradition..."⁸¹⁵

Al-Ḥaṭṭābī then remarks: "You asked me to help you with knowledge and evidence which could support us in establishing the truth and refuting the

'l-jama'āt al-hāditha...' In SM, *op. cit.*, p.137, the phrase reads: "'wa amma 'l-qawl fī 'l-ism ahuwa al-musammā am huwa gayr al-musammā fā-innahū mina 'l-hamaqāt al-hāditha...'" This also occurs on p. 194

⁸⁰⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

⁸⁰⁹Günther, von Sebastian, 'Der šāfi'iische Traditionalist Abū Sulaimān al-Ḥaṭṭābī und die Situation der religiösen Wissenschaften im 10. Jahrhundert,' in ZDMG, vol. 146, no. I (1996), p. 61-91; Referring to Brockelmann's GAL, Van Donzel however mentions twelve works by al-Ḥaṭṭābī, one of which was published, i.e. *Bayān I'jāz al-Qur'ān* (Aligarh: 1953), ed. 'Abd al-'Alim. See Van Donzel, et al, "al-Khaṭṭābī," in EI², IV, p. 1131-2.

⁸¹⁰GAL, I, 161, 165, S. I, 261, 275.

⁸¹¹Ibn Taymiyya, *Majmū'at al-Rasā'il al-Kubrā* (Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Āmira al-Sharafiyya, 1323/1906), vol. I, p. 439-440.

⁸¹²Günther, *op. cit.*, p. 74-80.

⁸¹³Makdisi, "the Non-Ash'arite," *op. cit.*, p. 255.

⁸¹⁴No information could be found explaining, to whom this word "brother" refers.

⁸¹⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

concept of those people [viz. the *Mutakallimūn*] with the use of argument and demonstration.”⁸¹⁶

Furthermore, he expresses his concern saying: “Then I thought of this affair. In it, I found the greatest reason that the Satan, today, started, with the help of his subtle deceit, to seduce every one who claims to possess a broad knowledge, excellent intelligence and sagacity. The Satan makes him dubious [with the following dilemma:] If for his religious practice and his school, he is only pleased to adopt the literal meaning of the tradition (*al-sunna*) and will be satisfied with taking clear evidence out of it, he becomes an example for the laymen and will be considered one from the mass of the people (*al-jumhūr*) and one among many only!”⁸¹⁷

In another passages, he criticized the *Mutakallimūn* saying: “When they [viz. the *Mutakallimūn*] saw the Book of God the Almighty speaking against what they argue and testifying against the falsity of what they believe, they contrasted some of its verses with other ones and interpreted them according to what exists in their minds. However, [the Book] stands directly against the principles which they established. They then oppose the traditions (*ahbār*) of the Messenger of God - may God bless him and grant him peace - and his *Sunna* which is adduced from him. They left them [viz. *ahbār*] out. But they transmitted the speech in an evil manner. [Therefore, the Pious Ancestors] were prejudiced against them and accused them of having committed heresy.”⁸¹⁸

Condemning the *Mutakallimūn*, al-Ḥāfiẓī reveals the proper attitude of the Pious Ancestors with respect to *kalām*. According to al-Ḥāfiẓī, the Pious Ancestors “understood well that they had [good] knowledge of the Book and its wisdom and of the apprehension of the Sunna and the evidence deduced therefrom, being in no need of anything else than both of these.”⁸¹⁹

Responding to the accusation of the *Mutakallimūn* that al-Ḥāfiẓī rejected the use of rational evidences on which the soundness of principles of religion is founded, he remarks: “We neither refute the rational evidences nor their competence to lead us to the knowledge. But when using them, we do not follow the method which you applied during the establishment of the argument with the help of the accidents and by referring these accidents to the essences as well as the transformation of these accidents into the essences for [understanding] the creation of the Universe and the existence of the Creator. We dislike the use of such a method [by turning to] something which has the clearest evidence and soundest demonstration. Because that is a matter which you take from the philosophers and due to which you followed them. The philosophers apply this method, only because they neither affirm the prophethood nor believe that the truth has been already born in [their prophethood]. The strongest thing in the argumentation affirming these affairs, in their opinion, is what they deduced from these things.”⁸²⁰

Asserting that *kalām* is an innovation, al-Ḥāfiẓī argues: “If some people from among the Companions adhere to the opinion of those [who are occupied

⁸¹⁶Ibidem.

⁸¹⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 138-9.

⁸¹⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

⁸¹⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

⁸²⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 140-1.

with] *kalām* and debate, they would have been regarded as belonging to the group of the *Mutakallimūn*. The names of the *Mutakallimūn* among them would have been known to us as also the names of the jurists, the reciters and the sufists among them. If not, that means that they were not involved in *kalām*.⁸²¹

Concluding his discussion, al-Hāttābī says: ‘If someone says: ‘Thus, it is necessary to respond to this [kind of] proposition that you put forward, [by stating that] the belief in God and the knowledge of His oneness were obligatory for one who possesses the intelligence only after the Messenger has been sent to him. If [the Messenger was not sent to him], avoiding to [believe in God] does not bring down any punishment and chastisement on him,’ the following words should be said [to him]: ‘We are also of the opinion that this is in line with what God - the Majesty – has said: ...We have not been accustomed to punish until We have sent a messenger.’’⁸²²

[f.] *Sharḥ Uṣūl I‘tiqād Ahl al-Sunna wa ’l-Jamā‘a* (forthwith called: SU) by *al-Shayḥ al-Imām al-Ālim al-Hāfiẓ Abu ’l-Qāsim Hibat Allāh b. al-Hasan b. Manṣūr al-Tabarī al-Lālakā’ī*

Al-Lālakā’ī was born in Tabāristān and died in Bagdad in *Ramadān* 418/1028. He was an expert in tradition, and thus known as *al-hāfiẓ*. He studied jurisprudence under the guidance of Abū Hāmid⁸²³ and wrote several books. The work to be discussed has been edited by Ahmad Sa‘d Ḥamdan (Riyāḍ: 1985).⁸²⁴

Like other scholars of tradition, al-Lālakā’ī condemns innovation, heresy, and argument. His *Sharḥ* is replete with censures against dispute and *kalām*. In one passage, al-Lālakā’ī states that it is obligatory to refrain from innovations and from listening to what is innovated by those who lead people astray.⁸²⁵ In another, he states that the first innovation to appear in Islam was the dispute on *al-qadar*, concerning which ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar was asked. He then produces the narration on the authority of the Prophet who commanded people to confirm the *qadar*, to believe in it and to refrain from disputing about it. The same question, according to al-Lālakā’ī was also posed to Ibn ‘Abbās, Abū Sa‘id al-Hudrī and many other scholars.⁸²⁶

Al-Lālakā’ī’s harsh criticism of those who befriend and discuss with a heretic and an innovator is clearly indicated by his remark: “No crime perpetrated by Muslims is bigger than having a discussion with an innovator. No abasement and

⁸²¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

⁸²²Al-Isrā’ (XVII): 16. Bell, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 264; SM, *op. cit.*, p. 147..

⁸²³According to Makdisi, Abū Hāmid al-Isfarā’īnī was a Shāfi‘ite professor who was severely critical of the Ash‘arites and took every opportunity to disassociate himself from them. He was the author of a *Ta‘līqa* on *uṣūl al-fiqh*, a commentary of Shāfi‘ī’s *rīsāla*. In this work, Abū Hāmid put forth the doctrine of Shāfi‘ī and the Shāfi‘ites regarding the Koran as uncreated, and declared those who disagree (i.e. Ash‘arites among others) to be unbelievers. See his article “The Non-Ash‘arite Shāfi‘ism of Ghazzali” in REI, (1986), p. 239-257.

⁸²⁴*Sharḥ Uṣūl I‘tiqād Ahl al-Sunna wa ’l-Jamā‘a*, ed. Ahmad Sa‘d Ḥamdan (Riyāḍ: Dār al-Tayyib li Naṣḥ wa ’l-Tawzī’, 1985), vol. I, p. 9-49.

⁸²⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

⁸²⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

vileness can be worse than their negligence of the pious ancestors' method of dealing with heretics.”⁸²⁷

Furthermore al-Lālakā’ī quotes ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib as having said: “There will be people who [are coming to] debate you. So, encounter them with the help of the traditions! The adherents of the traditions are more knowledgeable of the book of God.” He also quotes the words of Ḥalil b. Aḥmad⁸²⁸: “It happens very often that a debate is followed by another one which abolishes it.” An interesting quotation dealing with the censure of *kalām* by al-Lālakā’ī can also be found in Ḥarim b. Ḥayyān’s⁸²⁹ remark: “An author of *kalām* finds himself in one of two positions: When he is ignorant of it, he is defeated [by his opponent]; but when he is deeply rooted in it, he sins.”⁸³⁰

Al-Suyūṭī’s discussion of al-Lālakā’ī’s unfavourable remark on *kalām* is concluded with the latter’s reference to Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna (d. 196/811)⁸³¹ who used to recite the lines of Ibn Shubruma (d. 144/761):⁸³²

“If you say: Make every effort in religious service and be patient # Persist [in doing it!] they then say: [‘no’],⁸³³ argumentation is more preferable

That is an opposition to the Companions of the Prophet and also an innovation # they are the blindest and the most ignorant in [observing] the course of truth”⁸³⁴

A great number of persons from the *Ahl al-Sunna* listed by al-Lālakā’ī in his SU are also incorporated by al-Suyūṭī in SM, apparently giving the impression that those individuals can be also regarded as opponents of *kalām*. These people are classified into (1) the first generation, the Companions of the Prophet, (2) the second generation, the Followers, (3) the third generation, the Followers of the Followers, and (4) people from among the residents of Mecca, Syria/Palestine (Shām), Mesopotamia, Egypt, Kūfa, Baṣra, Rayy, Mosul, Ḥurasān, Bagdad and Tabāristān.⁸³⁵

As far as the abridgement of SU by al-Suyūṭī in SM is concerned, it is instructive to note several points: *First*, al-Suyūṭī only chose a number of

⁸²⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

⁸²⁸Al-Ḥalil b. Aḥmad al-Farāhidī was born approximately in the first century of Hijra. He was a teacher of Sibawayhi and the founder of prosody (*‘ilm al-‘arūḍ*). He was the author of *Kitāb al-‘Ayn* who died ca. 175/792. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 165, n. 1 (N).

⁸²⁹According to Caskel, Ḥarim b. Ḥayyān was “one of the earliest pietist of Islam and a forerunner of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī. See Caskel, W., “Abd al-Kās,” in EI², I, p. 72-4.

⁸³⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

⁸³¹According to Spectorsky, Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna b. Maymūn al-Hilālī, born in Kūfa in 107/725 and died in Mecca in 196/811, was known as Qur’ān commentator (*mufassir*) and a jurist. His fame, however, rests mainly on his being *muhaddith*. See Spectorsky, S.A., “Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna,” in EI², IX, p. 772.

⁸³²Ibn Shubruma, ‘Abd Allāh b. Shubruma b. al-Tufayl al-Dabbī was referred to by his biographers as a traditionist, jurist and *qādī* of Kūfa. His grandfather, Shubruma was a Companion of the Prophet. According to Vadet, “the Ḥanbalis and the Medinens were more indulgent towards him than the ruling orthodox (e.g. ‘Abd Allāh b. Mubārak, who taught from 141/758, especially Ibn Sa’d, who mocks Ibn Shubruma severely in the portrait he gives of him)”. He died in 144/761. See Vadet, J.C., “Ibn Shubruma,” in EI², III, p. 938.

⁸³³The word in the square bracket is taken from SU (p. 149).

⁸³⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 167-8..

⁸³⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 161-5.

arguments against *kalām* by al-Lālakā'ī, which are scattered over pages 9-49, 114, 129-130, 146, and 148-9 of the first volume of the Ḥamdān edition, which covers 369 pages (the 2nd volume comprises 305 pages) and summarized them on only 20 printed pages of SM (p. 148-168). *Secondly*, al-Suyūtī notes at the end of his abridgement that al-Lālakā'ī was the Shafi'iite *hāfiẓ* and jurist who was given a certificate of jurisprudence by Abū Hāmid al-Isfara'inī, "a Shafi'iite professor who was severely critical of the Ash'arites and took every opportunity to disassociate himself from them."⁸³⁶

Although al-Suyūtī does not explicitly mention a reason why he incorporated SU into his SM, it is to recall the suggestion of Ḥamdān that this work exercised very important influence on what he calls the 'Salafi school' (*al-madhab al-salafi*). This work, he argues, constitutes a significant reference which sheds lights on the knowledge of the religious doctrines ('aqā'id) of the scholars among the Pious Ancestors.⁸³⁷

[g.] *Al-Shari'a* by the Imām Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ājurī

Al-Ājurī was born in Ajur, a district in the west-side of Bagdad. He was a Shafi'iite judge and the author of many monographs on Tradition, such as *al-Arba'un al-Ājurīyya*, *al-Shari'a fi 'l-Sunna*, *Aḥlāq al-'Ulamā'*, etc. In 330/942, he embarked on a pilgrimage to Mecca and stayed there until his death in 360/970.⁸³⁸ His *Shari'a* has been edited by Muḥammad Hāmid al-Faqī.⁸³⁹

The passages of his work abridged by al-Suyūtī concern the censure of debate and argumentation in matters of religion by his predecessors. First of all, he quotes al-Ājurī as having adduced from Ma'an b. 'Isā⁸⁴⁰ the words: "A man suspected to be a Murji'iite came to Mālik b. Anas. So he said: 'O Abū 'Abd Allāh! Hear from me about a thing, about which I talk and dispute with you.' He replied: 'If you overcome me?' He said: '[If I overcome you,] you must follow me.' He asked: 'What if another man comes, and he talks with us and then defeats us?' He replied: 'We will follow him.' So, Mālik said: 'O 'Abd Allāh, God delegated Muḥammad - may God bless him and grant him peace - to propagate one religious mission. But I see you converting from one particular faith to another one.' 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz said: 'He who makes his religious tenet(s) the object of disputations, always changes [his faith].'"⁸⁴¹

Furthermore al-Suyūtī quotes another interesting remark of al-Ājurī on the heretics in the following words: "Anyone who upholds Tradition is admonished to abandon all the heretics including the Kharijites, Qadarites, Murji'ites, Jahmites, Mu'tazilites, Rafidites, Naṣibites⁸⁴² and anyone whom the leading scholars of the Muslims identify with an author of a misleading innovation. One is not admonished to talk to him, to greet him, to befriend him, to pray behind

⁸³⁶Makdisi, "the Non-Ash'arite Shafi'iism," *op. cit.*, p. 243.

⁸³⁷See the introduction of SU, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

⁸³⁸GAL, I, 164, S.I, 274.

⁸³⁹*Al-Shari'a* (Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Sunna al-Muḥammadiyya, 1369/1950).

⁸⁴⁰Ma'an b. 'Isā b. Yaḥyā al-Ashja'i Abū Yaḥyā al-Qazzāz al-Madanī was one of the leading scholars of tradition and died in 198/815. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 169, n. 1 (N).

⁸⁴¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

⁸⁴²Van Ess says that according to the Isma'ilite Abū Ḥātim al-Razī, the Nasibites (*nawāṣib*) is a nickname for the Murji'ites. Van Ess, TG, vol. IV, p. 685, n. 15.

him, to give [his daughter] to him in marriage, to get married to him, to accompany him, to deal with him, to argue with him and to debate with him. One is rather to humiliate him. If you meet him on the street, take another road if it is possible.”⁸⁴³

According to al-Suyūtī, al-Ājurri also refers to ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib as having vexed the heretics and said:

When I hear a saying that is reprehensible # I light my fire and I then call
[Qanbara]⁸⁴⁴

By including this poetry, al-Suyūtī may have wanted to give the impression that when ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib was encountered with a question of *kalām*, he prepared himself for a fight, for the purpose of which he called his *mawla*’, i.e. Qanbara to bring to his master all the fighting equipment, such as armor, sword, etc.

In his concluding passages, al-Ājurri reports that ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz sent a letter to ‘Adī b. Arṭāt (d. 102/820-1)⁸⁴⁵ about the Qadarites: “I request them to repent. Unless they repent, you must hit their necks.” Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik is also referred to by al-Ājurri as having hit Gaylān⁸⁴⁶ on his neck and crucified him. The emirs after them used to afflict punishment to the heretics depending on the [evil] viewpoint(s) that they [viz. the heretics] expressed. The learned men do not refuse [this fact]. Then he adduced from Mu‘ādh b. Jabal the words: “The Messenger of God - may God bless him and grant him peace - said: ‘If innovations occur among my *ummā*, the learned is told to proclaim his knowledge. He, among them, who does not do so, upon him is God’s curse, the angels’ and all of the people’s curse.’”⁸⁴⁷

No other explicit reason can be found in SM to explain why al-Suyūtī incorporated *al-Shari‘a* into his SM than the fact that several pages of the work explicitly deal with the condemnation of *kalām*. However, Brockelmann’s reference to al-Ājurri as a prominent Shafi‘ite jurist who composed several important works⁸⁴⁸ and whose authority is, according to Ismā‘il, extensively cited by more than fifteen biographers⁸⁴⁹ can be regarded as a major reason.

[h.] *Qūt al-Qulūb* of Abū Ṭālib Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Hārithī al-Makkī

Some biographical information on Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī is provided by al-Suyūtī at the end of his summary. Referring to al-Dhahabī in *al-Ibar*, al-Suyūtī narrates

⁸⁴³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

⁸⁴⁴A copying error also occurs in this place. The correct word for *qanīr* is *qanbara* which points to a former slave of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. See *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāga* by Ibn Abī al-Hadid (Cairo: Dār Ihya‘i l-Kutub al-‘Arabiyya, 1959), vol. II, p. 70.

⁸⁴⁵‘Adī b. Arṭāt al-Fazārī, Abū Wāthla, according to Bearman, was a governor who was appointed by ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz in place of Yazid b. al-Muḥallab. He received the order from ‘Umar to arrest the sons of al-Muḥallab. He was killed by Mu‘āwiya b. Yazid in 102/820-1. See Bearman, P.J., “‘Adī b. Arṭāt,” in EI², XII, p. 41.

⁸⁴⁶Gaylān b. Muslim al-Dimashqī al-Qibti (probably al-Nabaṣī) was killed in the era of Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik, who reigned from 105 to 125/724-743. See “Hishām,” in EI², III, 493-5.

⁸⁴⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

⁸⁴⁸GAL, I, 164, S.I, 274.

⁸⁴⁹This is mentioned by the editor of al-Faqī, the editor of *al-Shari‘a*. See the introduction of *al-Shari‘a*, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

that one of the leading Malikite scholars, Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. ‘Aṭiyya al-Hārithī al-‘Ajamī, was resident of a mountainous area in the surroundings of Mecca. He studied *taṣawwuf* and wrote a Sufi book.⁸⁵⁰ Massignon provides additional biographical information about al-Makkī. According to him, al-Makkī was a traditionist and mystic, well-known as the head of the dogmatic school of the Sālimiyya. *Qūt al-Qulūb* is his chief work, whole pages of which were copied by al-Gazālī (d. 505/1111) in his *Iḥyā*.⁸⁵¹ He died in Bagdad in 386/998.

In his discussion of *kalām*, in his *Qūt al-Qulūb*, al-Makkī starts with the history of the composition of books and other collected materials. In his opinion, the first and second generation did not compose any books. The composition occurred only after 120/739, after the death of all the Companions and the Old followers. Furthermore he remarks: “the first books composed in Islam were: *Kitāb ibn Jurayj* on *āthār* and various works on *tafsīr* by ‘Atā’, Mujāhid and the companions of Ibn ‘Abbās in Mecca. Then followed a work by Mu‘ammār b. Rāshid al-Šan‘ānī, in which he collected scattered traditions and classified them into [several] chapters. Then followed *Kitāb al-Muwatta* on jurisprudence by Mālik b. Anas, in Madina. Likewise, Ibn ‘Uyayna composed *Kitāb al-Jāmi‘ wa'l-Tafsīr* dealing with the variant readings in the science of the Koran, and with the variations of traditions (*al-ahādīth al-mutafarrīqā*). In the meantime, Sufyān al-Thawrī also composed his works. So, these five books are the first ones which were composed after the death of al-Hasan, Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyab and the chosen Followers as well as after 120 or 130 H.”⁸⁵²

“After 200 years and after the passage of three centuries, i.e., in the following fourth century,” the composition of books on *kalām* was started by the *Mutakallimūn*, who based their arguments on reason, heresy and analogy. Due to this composition, al-Makkī goes on, some grave conditions came into being. He reports, for instance, that “(then after that the period mentioned above had passed by) the affair became confused at this moment. In time, the *Mutakallimūn* were called learned men. Story-tellers were named knowledgeable men. Likewise, transmitters and narrators were called learned men,⁸⁵³ despite the absence of an understanding of religious rules and of religious truth.”⁸⁵⁴ Therefore, “[people] chose rational [knowledge] and common sense in preference to the literal significances of the Koran and the *āthār*.⁸⁵⁵

Furthermore, al-Makkī laments that “at the end of the world, there will be learned men to whom the door of religious practice is closed and to whom the door of debate is opened.” Like other scholars of tradition, al-Makkī, by referring to a number of leading scholars, such as Mālik b. Anas, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, etc, devotes a long passage to censure the scholars of debate, argumentation and

⁸⁵⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

⁸⁵¹Massignon, L., “Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī”, EI², I, 153; Brockelmann, G.I, 200, S.I, 359, 366.

⁸⁵²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 174-5.

⁸⁵³This is rendered from the phrase in QQ (p. 37), which reads “wa ‘I-ruwwā wa ‘I-naqala yuqālu ‘ulamā’...” In SM, it reads “wa ‘I-ruwwāt al-naqala ‘ulamā’ min gayri fiqhīn fī dīnin...” See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

⁸⁵⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

⁸⁵⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

kalām. One of his censures, for instance, reads that scholars of *kalām* are atheists.⁸⁵⁶

Concluding his discussion of al-Makkī's condemnation of *kalām*, al-Suyūtī quotes the former as having reported that "a companion of al-Shāfi‘ī [d. 203/820] left Abū Thawr [d. 240/854], when he spoke in response to an innovator concerning the rejection of the attributes." Asserting his argument, al-Makkī quotes another example: "When asked about the tradition that God has created Adam in accordance with His image, Ahmād [b. Abī Du‘ād, d. 239/854]⁸⁵⁷ became angry. Hence, Abū Thawr shrank from [the debate] and apologized [for it]."⁸⁵⁸

Concluding his discussion, al-Makkī, according to al-Suyūtī, remarked: "So, this was the course of life of the pious ancestors. They neither listen to an innovator nor argue against him with the help of debate and argumentation. Because that is an innovation. They rather advise them about the traditions. They [must] shrink [from debate], otherwise they [must] apologize for their innovation and abandon it because of God."⁸⁵⁹

QQ, which the present author consulted, consists of two volumes, each of which comprises two parts. Al-Suyūtī may have wanted to incorporate QQ into his SM for two reasons: *First*, in order to use al-Makkī's critical remarks against *kalām* and the *Mutakallimūn* as quoted above; and *secondly*, because of al-Makkī's prominence. This is obviously indicated by al-Suyūtī's reference to the former as one of the leading Malikite scholars and as the author of many works, as can be read in al-Suyūtī's concluding remarks in the last passage.⁸⁶⁰

As far as the abridgement of QQ by al-Suyūtī into SM is concerned, al-Suyūtī re-arranges al-Makkī's arguments in QQ. He quotes al-Makkī's discussion of the history of knowledge first, after which follows the latter's discussion of the censure of debating. In QQ, the order of the arguments is opposite. *Secondly*, al-Suyūtī only chose a number of al-Makkī's arguments against *kalām*, which are scattered over pages 6-50 of the 2nd part of the first volume of his work, and summarized them in only 8 printed pages of SM. Al-Suyūtī can be said to have succeeded in presenting al-Makkī's arguments against *kalām* in a more penetrating manner.

[i.] *Jāmi‘ Bayān al-‘Ilm wa Fadlih* (furtherwith called: JB) of Abū ‘Umar Yūsuf b. ‘Abd al-Barr al-Nimarī

al-Nimarī was born in Cordoba on 24 Rabi II 368/30 November 978. He studied under the supervision of Abū ‘Umar Ahmād b. ‘Abd al-Mālik b. Hāshim in Cordoba and became the greatest traditionist in the Magrib. At the very

⁸⁵⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

⁸⁵⁷This probably points to Ahmād b. Abī Du‘ād al-Iyādī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh, Mu‘tazilite *Qādī*, who was born in Başra in ca. 160/776 and referred to by Zetterstéen as a fervent follower of the Mu‘tazilite doctrine and as being appointed as Chief *Qādī* during the reign of al-Mu‘taṣim. The notorious merit which is always ascribed to him by his biographers is that he played an important role in the examination of Ahmād b. Ḥanbal during the Inquisition. He died at the end of 239/May-June 854. See Zetterstéen, K.V., "Ahmād b. Abī Du‘ād," in EI², I, 271.

⁸⁵⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

⁸⁵⁹Ibidem.

⁸⁶⁰Ibidem.

beginning he was a Zahirite, then a Malikite, and at last he became a follower of the Shafi'i school of law. He was appointed *Qādī* of Lisbon and Santarem during the reign of the Aftasid ruler, al-Muẓaffar. He died on 29 *Rabi'* II 463/3 February 1071.⁸⁶¹ His work has been edited by Ahmad b. 'Umar al-Mahmasānī al-Bayrūtī al-Azhārī and published in Cairo, in 1902.⁸⁶²

In the work, as abridged by al-Suyūtī, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr discusses two topics: The hatefulness of debate and argumentation;⁸⁶³ and the censuring of speculation on matters of belief in God based on personal opinion and analogy without referring to textual foundations.⁸⁶⁴ Ibn 'Abd al-Barr began his discussion by referring to the tradition of the Pious Ancestors. According to him, the Pious Ancestors prohibited dispute on the Nature of God and His Attributes. In contrast, they allowed dispute and argumentation in jurisprudence, because this is knowledge concerning the rules to be derived from principles.⁸⁶⁵

Like other traditionalists, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr discusses the censure of debate, argumentation and *kalām* by his predecessors which revolves around the following points: (a) That one who subjects his religion to altercation, is likely to move from one religion to another (which implies *ridda*). (b) That one has to avoid argumentation, because it foils religious practices; (c) *Kalām* on matters of religion is rejectable. (d) The scholars of tradition and jurisprudence reached a consensus that the scholars of *kalām* are innovators and cheaters.

Interestingly Ibn 'Abd al-Barr associates the debate on the attributes of God with the destruction of the world and that of the safety of the *umma*. This is clearly indicated by the words of Ibn al-Hanafiyya, which al-Suyūtī quoted: "The world comes to an end, not before they dispute on [the attributes of] their God." The same holds true for the words of Ibn 'Abbās: "The affair of this *umma* remains almost the same, until they speak about *al-wildān*⁸⁶⁶ and *qadar*."⁸⁶⁷

Furthermore, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr incorporated the famous poetry of Ishāq b. Abī Isrā'il,⁸⁶⁸ who refused to be occupied with debate and argumentation:

"Do I need to lay in wait after my bones trembled # while death is closest of what is adjacent to me

To debate with any opponent # also rendering his religious belief a target of mine
and abandoning what I have already known due to an opinion of one other than me #
while personal views do not resemble absolute knowledge (*al-'ilm al-yaqīni*)

⁸⁶¹GAL, I, 368, S. I, 628.

⁸⁶²The complete title is *Jāmi' Bayān al-'Ilm wa Fadlih wa mā Yanbagī fī Riwāyatih wa Hamlīh*.

⁸⁶³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 182-188.

⁸⁶⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 189-191.

⁸⁶⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

⁸⁶⁶This points to the question on the fate of the children of the infidels, who die before reaching the adult age, whether they will be among the inhabitants of Paradise. Responding to this question, the scholars, according to Wensink, are divided into three groups: *First*, the majority of scholars maintain that the children, like their parents, will go to Hell; *the second group* hold off to give any opinion; *the last ones* are of the opinion that the children will go to Paradise. Wensink, A.J., *The Muslim Creed, Its Genesis and Historical Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932), p. 43.

⁸⁶⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

⁸⁶⁸Ishāq b. Abī Isrā'il b. Kāmihr al-Marwazī, whose *kunya* was Abū Ma'yūb, died in 246/861. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 166, n.4 (N).

In my opinion, dispute is nothing but an ambiguity # which moves freely from the left to
the right

The upright traditions have been established for us # [the debater] rather errs in his
argument in any direction

To the truth does not belong any secrecy # which deceives like the blaze of a clear star

For us, the method of Jahm cannot replace # the method of Son of Amīna the
Trustworthy⁸⁶⁹

What I know suffices for me # and what I ignore, let it stay away from me!

I am not one who considers a person who prays an infidel # and I do not harm you if
you consider me an infidel⁸⁷⁰

We were brothers, together we reproach # so let us reproach every suspicious skeptic
Thus, mannerism still exists. If it reproaches us # by one case, all cases can be split up
So, a pillar of a house is about to fall down # likewise, one relative is separated from the
other.”⁸⁷¹

Concluding this chapter, he then recites a poem which reads:

“[When] people get offended, they fabricate innovations # in religious tenets with the
help of reason for the sake of which the Messengers were not dispatched
So, most of them value God’s religious teachings lightly# They are rather busy with a
matter which drags them away from their religion.”

Then follows another topic in which Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr quotes ‘Awf b. Mālik al-Ashja‘ī as having said: “The Messenger of God - may God bless him and grant him peace - said: ‘My *umma* will split into seventy one denominations, the greatest of which is a fascination. People judge religious [ordinance] with the help of their *ra'y*. They prohibit what God permitted. They also permit what God prohibited.’”⁸⁷² Then, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr quoted the words of ‘Umar b. al-Ḥaṭṭāb: “You have to refrain from authors of personal opinions, because they are enemies of the *Sunan*”. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr also asserts that once expressing a personal opinion, one is led astray and leads others astray.⁸⁷³ The rest of the passages are replete with censures and condemnations of the use of personal opinion and analogy.

In discussing Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s arguments against *kalām*, al-Suyūtī does not directly refer to JB. He rather relies on its abridgement by al-Qurtūbī, to whom al-Suyūtī refers as the *Imām al-‘Allāma Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Abī Bakr al-Ansārī al-Hazrajī*, a popular author who died in Upper Egypt in 659/1262.⁸⁷⁴

To know in which ways al-Suyūtī abridges JB and presents Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s arguments against *kalām* in SM, it is imperative to refer to JB, since the *Muhtaṣar* by al-Qurtūbī is no longer extant. Al-Suyūtī only took two chapters, covering 32 printed pages in JB, out of 74 chapters consisting of 492 printed pages. He

⁸⁶⁹This probably points to the Prophet Muḥammad, a son of Āmina b. Wahb b. ‘Abd Manāf.

⁸⁷⁰This is rendered from the phrase in SM, which reads “ *wa lam ujrimkum an takfurūnī*.” In JB (p. 365), it reads “ *wa mā uḥarrimukum an takfurūnī*.” SM, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

⁸⁷¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 184-5.

⁸⁷²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

⁸⁷³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 189-92.

⁸⁷⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 192; Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Abī Bakr al-Ansārī al-Hazrajī al-Andalusī, according to Arnaldez, was a Malikite scholar, an expert in *hadīth*, who was known for his commentary on the Koran. He was born in Spain and died in Upper Egypt in 671/1272. See Arnaldez, R., “Al-Kurṭubī,” in EI², V, 512-3.

abridged those two chapters in merely 10 printed pages of SM. This is obviously the result of the fact that al-Suyūṭī has cut the long chains of transmission of the prophetic narrations and/or arguments of leading scholars, which deal with the censure of *kalām*. on several occasions, al-Suyūṭī mentions only the transmitter closest to the sources themselves.

[j.] *Sharaf Ashāb al-Hadīth* (further called: SAH) by the Ḥāfiẓ Abū Bakr Ahmad b. ‘Alī b. Thābit b. Ahmad b. Mahdī al-Shāfi‘ī, well-known as al-Ḥaṭīb al-Bagdādī Al-Ḥaṭīb al-Bagdādī was born in Bagdad in 392/1002. He was one of the leading scholars in the field of Tradition, jurisprudence and *uṣūl al-fiqh*. Like his father, he was a Hanbalite at first, then converted to the Shafi‘ite *madhhab*. According to Sellheim, al-Ḥaṭīb’s fame was based on his biographical encyclopaedia of more than 7800 scholars and other personalities, among whom were included women, connected to the cultural and political life in Bagdad. He became an authority on *hadīth* because of his profound erudition in this field. His works on *hadīth*, Sellheim maintains, have made him the great critical systematiser of *hadīth* methodology.⁸⁷⁵

SAH was edited by M.S. Hatıboğlu and published in Ankara in 1971, based on five MSS which are respectively preserved in Istanbul (MSS ‘Ātif Afandī), Cairo (Dār al-Kutub), Madina (Maktaba ‘Ārif Hikmat), Tübingen, and Damascus (Dār al-Kutub al-Zāhiriyya).⁸⁷⁶ The edited work comprises only one volume which consists of 138 printed pages. From this work, al-Suyūṭī abridged the relevant arguments of al-Ḥaṭīb al-Bagdādī against *kalām*, which occupies only five and a half printed pages in SM.

As the title of his work suggests, in SAH al-Bagdādī interestingly identifies the partisans of Tradition with a number of virtues in relation to their attitudes toward debate, reason and argumentation which occupied the *Mutakallimūn*. Before doing so, he starts by identifying some characteristics of the authors of innovation and their personal opinions: (1) that they scorned the adherents of the *Sunan* and *Athār*, refused to study the laws contained in the Koran, discarded the arguments derived from clear verses of the Koran and neglected the *Sunna*; (2) that they legislated in matters of religion by making use of their personal opinions; (3) that the young among them are greedy of words of love,⁸⁷⁷ while the old are fascinated by *kalām* and debate;⁸⁷⁸ (4) they subjected their religion to disputation;⁸⁷⁹ (5) that they are the enemies of the Tradition;⁸⁸⁰ (6) that they seek [religious] truth with the help of *kalām*.⁸⁸¹

⁸⁷⁵GAL, I, 329, S.I, 564; SM, *op. cit.*, p. 197; R. Sellheim, “al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī,” in EI², IV, 1111-2.

⁸⁷⁶SAH, *op. cit.*, p. 2.; GAL, ibidem.

⁸⁷⁷This is rendered from the phrase in SA (p. 4) which reads “fa ‘l-hadath minhum manhūm bi ‘l-gazal...” In SM, it reads “fa ‘l-hadath minhum mathūm bi ‘l-adl...” SM, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

⁸⁷⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

⁸⁷⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

⁸⁸⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

⁸⁸¹Abū Yūsuf is reported to have said these words. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

Al-Bagdādī also identifies them by quoting the poetry of Abū Muzāhim al-Ḥāqānī (d. 325/938)⁸⁸² censuring the *Mutakallimūn*:

“The *Mutakallimūn* and the authors of opinion have been deprived of # the knowledge of Tradition with which one is safe

If they know the *āthār* they do not turn away # from them toward [a thing] other than them; nevertheless, they are ignorant”⁸⁸³

By referring to a number of authorities, al-Bagdādī furthermore identifies the traditionists with a number of characteristics which can be summed up as follows: (1) They reprove debate on religious ordinances.⁸⁸⁴ (2) They can understand religious tenets only with the help of the *āthār* and not with the help of *al-ra'y*.⁸⁸⁵ (3) They regard the Book as their outfit and Tradition as their argument, and the Prophet as their affiliation and reference.⁸⁸⁶ (4) They are trustworthy, just and the protectors of religion and its preservers as well as the bearers of knowledge and its custodians.⁸⁸⁷ (5) The truth is always ascribed to them.⁸⁸⁸ (6) “Manliness is in the traditionists, *kalām* is in the Mu'tazilites and cheatfulness is in the Rafidites.”⁸⁸⁹

The arguments against *kalām* by al-Bagdādī which al-Suyūtī incorporated in his SM are scattered over several pages of his work (3-9, 32-34, 78-79). When dealing with al-Bagdādī's arguments against *kalām*, al-Suyūtī cuts the long chains of transmission. He mentions only the authority closest to the source. On several occasions, he even only mentions the author of an opinion. Al-Suyūtī only quotes the relevant narrations. Al-Bagdādī in his SAH, for instance, quotes Abū Yūsuf as having said: “Whoever seeks part of a [religious] truth with the help of *kalām*, commits heresy; and whoever seeks *garīb al-hadīth*, lies; whoever looks for wealth with the help of alchemy, loses his money (*aflasa*).”⁸⁹⁰ The last two sentences are not quoted by al-Suyūtī in his SM.⁸⁹¹

The topics which are not abridged by al-Suyūtī revolve around (1) the exhortation to convey a revealed message (*al-tablīg*), (2) the discussion of the usage of *isnād* for gaining knowledge, (3) general virtues of the partisans of Tradition and of befriending them as well as of the writing of Tradition, (4) the exhortation (for the young) to learn Tradition and to memorize as well as to spread it (5) the auspicious dream on the partisans of Tradition, etc.

[k.] *Al-Intiṣār li Ahl al-Hadīth* (forthwith called: IAH) by Abū Sa'd 'Abd al-Karīm b. Abī Bakr Muḥammad b. Abī al-Muẓaffar al-Manṣūr al-Tamīmī al-Marwazī al-Shāfi'i, known as Ibn al-Sam'ānī

⁸⁸² Abū Muzāhim Mūsā b. 'Ubayd Allah b. Yahyā b. Ḥāqān was considered by al-Dhahabī as *al-imām al-muqrī'* *al-muḥaddith*. His father and brother were ministers during the reigns of al-Mutawakkil and al-Mu'tamid. He died in 325/938). Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XV, 94-5.

⁸⁸³ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

⁸⁸⁴ These words are adduced on the authority of Mālik b. Anas. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

⁸⁸⁵ Sufyān al-Thawrī is reported to have said these words. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 193-4.

⁸⁸⁶ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

⁸⁸⁷ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

⁸⁸⁸ These are al-Walīd al-Karābī's last words to his son. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

⁸⁸⁹ Hārūn al-Rashīd is reported to have said these words. SM, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

⁸⁹⁰ SAH, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

⁸⁹¹ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

Ibn al-Sam‘ānī was born in Marw on 21 Shaban 506/10 February 1113. His father was an authority in the field of Shāfi‘ī law. His great biographical works on the Traditionist are *Kitāb al-Ansāb* and *Kitāb al-Taḥbīr fi ’l-Mu‘djam al-Kabīr*. His literary production centred on the prophetic traditions and their transmission. He died on the 1st of *Rabi‘I* 562/26th of December 1166.⁸⁹² That he was affiliated to Shafi‘ite law school is clearly reflected by the fact that al-Subkī devoted 5 printed pages to deal with his biography.⁸⁹³

Hajji Halīfa’s *Kashf al-Zunūn*, according to al-Nashshār, does not record any information about this work.⁸⁹⁴ Brockelmann’s GAL remains also silent about it. Likewise, Sellheim does not indicate the fact that Ibn al-Sam‘ānī has composed IAH.⁸⁹⁵ Hence, al-Suyūtī’s abridgement of al-Sam‘ānī’s arguments against *kalām*, which occupies thirty-eight and a half printed pages out of 224 printed-pages in SM,⁸⁹⁶ is of special value to understand at least part of this work by Ibn al-Sam‘ānī.

Based on the edition of SM, the present author organizes al-Sam‘ānī’s discussion in IAH as follows:⁸⁹⁷ The numbers in the second column are the page numbers of SM, the 2nd edition.

Chapter (<i>bāb</i>) on the Exhortation to the <i>Sunna</i> and the <i>Jamā‘a</i> and the Observance and on the Abhorrence of Disunity and Innovation	199- 204
Chapter (<i>fāṣl</i>) on the Censure of Debate and Disputations in Religious matters Reported by them and their Abhorrence of these matters	204- 209
A Question posed by the <i>Mutakallimūn</i>	209- 212
Chapter (<i>fāṣl</i>) on the Response to their Opinion maintaining that <i>Aḥbār al-āḥād</i> are not accepted as a way to acquire knowledge	212- 223
The Root of Religion is Observance	223- 231
Chapter (<i>fāṣl</i>) The Significance of Reason and its Position in Religion according to the Partisans of the Sunna (<i>Ahl al-Sunna</i>)	231- 236

In his introductory passages, al-Sam‘ānī explains that there are two groups who condemned the adherents of traditions: The people of *kalām* and people of personal opinions. These two groups used to associate the partisans of traditions with ignorance and a complete lack of knowledge. According to him, they, in fact, are themselves associated with these two qualities.⁸⁹⁸

⁸⁹² Sellheim, R., “al-Sam‘ānī,” in EI², VIII, p.1024-5.

⁸⁹³ Al-Subkī, TS, IV, p. 21-26.

⁸⁹⁴ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 198, n. 1 (N).

⁸⁹⁵ Sellheim, *op. cit.*, p.1024-5.

⁸⁹⁶ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 198-236.

⁸⁹⁷ Al-Suyūtī does not give any title for al-Sam‘ānī’s discussion in the first one and a half printed pages (SM, p. 198-9) preceding chapter (one). In this discussion, the present author refers to it as the introductory passages. The second editor of SM, Su‘āda, inserts a new sub-title, ‘The Statements of Leading Scholars Censuring *Kalām*’ (SM, p. 200) presumably due to the fact that al-Sam‘ānī starts his discussion in this passage with “*wa nadhkuru ’l-āna mā warada ‘ani l-a’imma fī dhamm al-kalām...*” The present author does not include this new title in the table above.

⁸⁹⁸ SM, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

[1] Chapter (*bāb*) on the Exhortation to the *Sunna* and the *Jamā'a*, Towards Observance and on the Abhorrence of Disunity and Innovation

Referring to several Koranic verses,⁸⁹⁹ he exhorts the *Sunna* and the *Jamā'a* and stresses the need for observance (*al-ittibā'*) as well as his abhorrence of disunity and innovation. Relying on DhK by al-Harawī, he also asserts that a number of traditions and *ahbār* of the Companions have been produced to command people to follow Tradition and to avoid innovation.⁹⁰⁰ Furthermore, he asserts the principle of the followers of the Sunna with respect to the usage of reason as follows: “the course of belief (*al-dīn*) is revelation (*al-sam'*) and tradition (*āthar*); the course of reason and referring to it as well as establishing the *sam'iyyāt* on it is legally reprehended and prohibited. We are discussing the position of reason in the *Shari'a* and the proportion of its usage, which was requested by the *Shari'a*, as well as the prohibition of trespassing that [proportion].”⁹⁰¹

To strengthen his conviction that *kalām* was prohibited, Ibn al-Sam'ānī, as an apologetic, felt urged to refer to a good number of leading scholars among his predecessors who had argued against it. In so doing, he interestingly lists al-Shāfi'i first.⁹⁰² He then also adduces the views of Sufyān al-Thawrī, Ahmad b. Hanbal, 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī, Sa'id b. Hamdīd,⁹⁰³ Abū Bakr b. Abī Dāwud al-Sijistānī, al-Hasan al-Baṣrī, Ibrāhīm al-Nuḥā'ī, Ibn 'Umar, and Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Hanzalī.

[2] Chapter (*fāṣl*) on the Censure of Debate and Disputation in Religious matters Reported of them and their Abhorrence of these matters

Although al-Sam'ānī acknowledges that there are a number of (prophetic) traditions and narrations on this topic, which have been dealt with by al-Harawī

⁸⁹⁹“And seek defence in the bond of Allah as one body, and do not separate ...” (Āli 'Imrān (III): 98. Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 55, v. I), and “He hath made accessible to you in religion what He laid as a charge upon Noah. And that which We have suggested to thee, and what We laid as a charge upon Abraham and Moses and Jesus, (saying): “Establish the religion and do not divide into parties regarding it.” Al-Shu'arā' (XLII): 11a-c. Bell, II, p. 485.

⁹⁰⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 199.

⁹⁰¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

⁹⁰²To him al-Sam'ānī ascribes the words: “Whoever is occupied with debate (*kalām*) on belief or on something pertaining to these heresies, for which is no precedent [at the time of] the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - and his companions, has introduced an innovation in Islām.” The Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - also said: “Whoever introduces an innovation or accepts a novelty in Islam, for him is the curse of God, of the angels and that of all the people. [Any innovation of his] - be it crooked or straight - will not be accepted.” SM, *op. cit.*, p. 200-1.

⁹⁰³To him the following verses are ascribed: “When you expelled me to a people # they are absent but formally exist// [You are] like one who does not use clean water # but satisfied with the *tayammum* with the use of the dust // The belief of the Prophet Muḥammad is *āthār* # the excellent garment for the youth is the *ahbār*// Do not neglect the tradition and its adherents! # the opinion is night and the tradition is day// The youth sometimes make a mistake in following the courses of guidance # the sun rises and to it belong the lights// The *Mutakallimūn* and the partisans of the opinion have been ignorant about # the science of Tradition with which one is safe// If they knew the *āthārs*, they would have not turned away # from them to the other. But, they have been ignorant//The *Mutakallimūn* called us from your deviation # How many changes you aspire to the religion of God//The people do not produce any innovation # until you make to it approach and interpretation.” SM, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

in his DhK, and also some that have not been dealt with in it, it is less significant, however, to deal with them here, since the arguments against *kalām* that al-Sam‘ānī proposes have also been dealt with in other works abridged by al-Suyūtī in his SM. The following passages deal only with arguments by al-Sam‘ānī not to be traced in other sources.

To begin with, four chief heresies are identified by al-Sam‘ānī to have emerged at the end of the time of the companions: *al-qadar*, *al-irjā'* and the doctrine of the Harurites (*al-harūriyya*)⁹⁰⁴ as well as that of the Rafidites. Then follows the debate on the belief and disputations in the period of the Followers and that of those who came after them. This happened, he argues, due to the fact that "lies came into view; false testimonies were widespread; ignorance became public; matters pertaining to Tradition became obliterated."⁹⁰⁵ Al-Sam‘ānī presents a number of narrations dealing with the question on *qadar* posed to some prominent figures, such 'Umar b. Abd al-Azīz, 'Alī b. Abī Tālib, etc., and with their unfavourable answer to it.

[3] A Question posed by the *Mutakallimūn*

In this chapter, al-Sam‘ānī records the polemics between the opponents of *kalām* and its proponents. Al-Sam‘ānī makes use of the plural form *qālū*: the proponents of *kalām* who oppose the ideas of their adversaries with the introductory words *inna qawlakum*, referring to the opponents of *kalām*. Al-Sam‘ānī represents himself as an opponent of *kalām*, while explicitly referring to the theological views of al-Hasan al-Baṣrī⁹⁰⁶ as a proponent of *kalām*.

The polemic starts with the refutation of the partisans of *kalām* of the view of their adversaries that "the early generation of the Companions and the Followers did not occupy themselves with introducing rational evidence and with referring to reason for the knowledge of religious [doctrine]. However, they regarded this kind of *kalām* as an innovation, because, they [viz. the Companions and the Followers] were not occupied with it, nor by undertaking *ijtihād* on derivative cases (*al-furū'*) or seeking the legal status of novel cases (*al-hawādith*). None of the

⁹⁰⁴Referring to Dozy, McKane identifies the Harurites with the Ḥarijites. The Harurites, according to McKane, earned their appellation from *ḥarūrī*, which signifies strong and generous. See McKane's translation of *al-Ghazālī's Book of Fear and Hope* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962), p. 49, n. 1; Daftary, however, suggests that Harurites was the initial appellation for the Ḥarijites. This appellation was taken from the locality Ḥarūra, to which the first seceders (Ḥarijites) from 'Alī b. Abī Tālib's forces had retreated. Another appellation of the Ḥarijites, according to Daftary, was the *Shurāt* (the vendors), signifying those who sold their soul for the cause of God. See Daftary, Farhad, *The Ismā'īlīs: Their History and Doctrines* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

⁹⁰⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

⁹⁰⁶Al-Hasan al-Baṣrī was referred to by the scholars of Islamic theology as the eponym of the Basrite school of the Mu'tazilite, to which are affiliated a number of prominent personalities, such as Wāṣil b. 'Aṭā, 'Amr b. 'Ubayd, etc. See Amīn, *op. cit.*, III, p. 96; Toshihiko Izutsu, *The Concept of Belief in Islamic Theology: A Semantic Analysis of Īmān and Islām* (Yokohama: Yurindo Publishing co, ltd., 1965), p. 20. Al-Hasan al-Baṣrī's theological view becomes clear, for instance, in his remarks: 'Substances are substances and accidents are accidents before being originated' (p. 40). According to al-Hasan Baṣrī, a grave sinner is a hypocrite. Bagdadi Mu'tazilite, on the other hand, according to Izutsu, maintains that he belongs to an independent category between the two.

analogies, opinions and reasons to which the jurists paid particular attention was ascribed to them. This has emerged only after the time of the Followers of the Followers..."

Defending their contention that *kalām* is of great significance for matters of religion, they based their argument on the following points: the Prophetic tradition that reads "Anything which the muslims regard as agreeable is also agreeable in God's view; and anything which is regarded as bad by the muslims, is also bad in God's view. This is one of the matters which the Muslims regarded as agreeable, so it is agreeable in God's view." This is then asserted by al-Hasan al-Baṣrī's logical arguments which reads as follows: Innovation is divided into two sorts; Bad and good innovation. Al-Hasan al-Baṣrī said: Narratives [viz. on the prominent figures, places, etc] are innovations. In this case, they are allright. Many people benefit from them. [Likewise,] many calls are responded to, and many requests are fulfilled. Some [scholar related] that he was asked about praying at the end of the recitation of the Koran, as the people want to do at this moment. He replied: It is a good innovation. How could this kind of practice not be regarded as agreeable, when it comprises the refutation of the apostates, the heretics and the proponents of the opinion on the sempeternity of the universe as well as of the partisans of all heresies from this *ummā*! If philosophical speculation and reflection are not available, neither can truth be distinguished from falsity, nor goodness from badness.

By means of this knowledge, ambiguity has been removed from the hearts of the apostates, and belief of the *Muwahhidūn* [viz. those who affirm the oneness of God] has become firm. If you refute rational evidences, what do you believe concerning the sound principles of your religion. Which way do you follow to know their truths. All [the people] have known that the truth of the book is known, and the trustworthiness of the Prophet - may God bless him and grant him peace - is affirmed only with the help of reason. But, you have refused that fact. If evidence is not available, the meaning is unavailable too."⁹⁰⁷

The answer of al-Sam'ānī is clearly that *kalām* is prohibited, not only because of that which has been claimed by their adversaries, as mentioned above, i.e. that the Companions and the Followers had not been occupied with it, but also because God has said: "Today I have perfected your religion for you..."⁹⁰⁸ If He [viz. God] has already perfected and completed it, they argue, a Muslim should believe in it and rely on it. Asserting their contention, they remark: "So, why does one need to refer to rational evidence and their propositions? God by His virtue makes it superfluous and unnecessary to him. He did not introduce [man] to something, due to which one is seized by ambiguity and vaguenesses, and which leads one to destruction and troubles. Man strayed, perished and deviated only because of ideas and rational thoughts and his following the opinions of the past and the present. Man was safe only because he followed the traditions of the Messengers and the leading scholars among the early ancestors, who guide people to the right course."⁹⁰⁹ Re-emphasizing his hostile attitude to *kalām*, he then

⁹⁰⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 209-10.

⁹⁰⁸Al-Mā'ida (V): 5a. Bell, I, p. 94.

⁹⁰⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 211-2.

quotes the prayer of the Prophet: “O God, I ask your protection against knowledge which has no significance...”⁹¹⁰

[4] Chapter (*fāṣl*) on the Response to their Opinion maintaining that *Aḥbār al-āḥād* are not accepted as means to acquire knowledge

His response to this question is clearly indicated in his words: “This is [the opinion of] a chief of the innovators in his refutation of the *aḥbār*, and in establishing evidence by means of speculation and reflection.” Then he points to the Qadarites and the Mu‘tazilites, who issued this opinion and whose purpose it was to refuse the *aḥbār*. Furthermore he discusses how each group (Qadarites, Murji‘ites, Ḥarrijites) tries to argue in favour of the soundness of what they uphold with the help of *al-ḥabar al-wāḥid* with respect to many theological issues such as *al-wildān*.

With regard to this, Ibn al-Sam‘ānī criticized the attitude of every denomination concerning whether *Aḥbār al-Aḥad*⁹¹¹ in matters which are commonly known could be accepted or not. Based on innovations, each sect, Ibn Sam‘ānī argues, claims that what they believe is in accordance with the Tradition of the Prophet; and that it is part of the *shari‘a* of Islam. To them, he directs the following critical remarks: “none of denominations search for religion by using a single method. For, they consult their reason, minds and personal opinions. So, they search for religion with the help of these. If they hear something from the Book and the Tradition, they examine it according to their rational standard. If it is right, they accept it. On the contrary, if it is not in line with their rational criterion, they refuse it. If they are compelled to accept it, they corrupt it with the help of far-fetched interpretations, and objectionable significances (*al-ma‘ānī al-mustankira*). Therefore they deviate from the truth, and turn away from it. They throw religion away. They also discard Tradition.”⁹¹²

Ibn al-Sam‘ānī then rejects these claims. According to him, the truth and the true belief, as God ordained, exclusively belong to the people of Tradition and the *āthār*, because they followed the footsteps of the Pious Ancestors whose belief was inherited from the Prophet.

[5] The Root of Religion is Observance

In this chapter, al-Sam‘ānī evaluates the view of his adversaries that “God, in the Koran, censures unquestioning imitation and entrusts humans with rational examination and deduction and also commands people to reflect and debate against the infidels with the help of rational evidences.” Al-Sam‘ānī, on the other hand, maintains that “unquestioning imitation of which we are ignorant, [should be] used for something related to the reports (*aḥādīth*) and the sayings (*aqwāl*) of the [pious] ancestors. As far as religious doctrine is concerned, the Book and the Tradition exhorted [us] to observance. They have said: Imitation is accepting [one’s opinion] without argument.”⁹¹³ In sum, he suggests people to obey what God has prescribed in the Koran.

⁹¹⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

⁹¹¹A tradition which goes back to a single authority. See EI², Glossary & Index, to vol. 1-viii (1997), *op. cit.*, p. 166.

⁹¹²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 218-9.

⁹¹³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

[6] Chapter (*fāṣl*) The Significance of Reason and its Position in Religion according to the Partisans of Sunna (*Ahl al-Sunna*)

In this chapter, al-Sam‘ānī evaluates the significance of reason. For him “reason neither ascribes any duty to a person, nor exempts anything from him. It has no authority in determining things as lawful or unlawful. Likewise, it cannot determine things as good or bad. If no single tradition is produced, no duty is imposed on anyone.”⁹¹⁴ With respect to the attitude toward reason of his adversaries, al-Sam‘ānī makes the following critical remarks: “Know that what distinguishes us from the innovators is the question of reason. They base their faith on rational thought. They made observance (*al-ittibā'*) and tradition follow rational thought. The adherents of Tradition, on the contrary, said: “The foundation of faith is observance (*al-ittibā'*), and reason (*al-'uqūl*) is subordinate [to it]. If the foundation of faith is built on rational thought, creatures may regard revelation and the prophets - may God bless them - as superfluous. The significance of command and prohibition becomes worthless.”⁹¹⁵

[I.] Abū al-Ma‘ālī ‘Abd al-Mālik al-Juwaynī, known as *Imām al-Haramayn*

Al-Juwaynī was born at Bushtanikan, a village on the outskirts of Nīshāpūr, on 18 Muḥarram 419/17 February 1028. He was connected to the school of *'ilm al-kalām* inaugurated by Abū al-Hasan al-Ash‘arī at the beginning of the fourth/tenth century. The title *Imām al-Haramayn* resulted from four years of teaching in Mecca and Madina. His scholarly research was divided between *uṣūl al-fiqh* and *'ilm al-kalām*. His two principle works on *uṣūl al-fiqh* are *al-Waraqāt fī uṣūl al-fiqh* and *al-Burhān fī uṣūl al-fiqh*. According to Brockelmann, it is in the role of doctor in *kalām* that al-Juwaynī made his deepest impression on Muslim thought. Unfortunately, his great work, *al-Shāmil*, has not been published. He died in the village of his birth on 25 Rabi‘ II 478/20 August 1085.⁹¹⁶

The *Madrasa Nizāmiya* of Nisabur in which the Shafī‘ite jurist al-Juwaynī became a professor, as Makdisi maintains, was a college of law which was established to produce doctors of law. One of his students was Abū Ḥāmid al-Gazālī. *Kalām* was not admitted as part of the curriculum.⁹¹⁷ Therefore it can be implied that al-Juwaynī’s professorship was one of Shafī‘ite law. This could be one of the reasons why al-Suyūtī incorporated al-Juwaynī into his list of the opponents of *kalām*.

In summarizing the words of al-Juwaynī against *kalām*, al-Suyūtī relies respectively on three authorities: *First*, Ibn al-Sam‘ānī in his *Ta’rīh* in which he quotes al-Juwaynī as having said: “When I go about my business, I do not turn to, and occupy myself with, *kalām*;” *Secondly*, al-Asnawī (d. 772/1371) who in his *Tabaqāt* quotes Abu ‘l-Ganā‘im b. Ḥusayn al-Urmawī, who had attended the circle of Imām al-Haramayn. The latter had asked al-Juwaynī “to read for him something pertaining to the knowledge of *kalām*. He, however, prohibited him to

⁹¹⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

⁹¹⁵SM, *op. cit.*, p. 235.

⁹¹⁶Brockelmann, C., “al-Djuwaynī,” in EI², II, 605-6.

⁹¹⁷G. Makdisi, “Law and Traditionalism in the Institutions of Learning” in *Theology and Law in Islam*, ed. G.E. von Grunebaum (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1971), p. 75-88.

do so, and said: When I go about my affair, I do not turn to [it], and I do not teach it;” *Thirdly*, Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1201) who quotes al-Juwainī in *Talbīs al-Iblīs* as having said: “I had abandoned the authorities of Islam and their knowledge. I then travelled over the greatest sea. Each time I sought the truth and fled from unquestioning imitation, I was choked [by the water]. Then I returned from all these things to the word of the truth: You must follow the faith of the old men (*dīn al-‘ajā’iz*). So, if the truth does not come to me by [God’s] grace, I will die with the faith of the old men. You impose upon me my affair with sincere words. So, woe unto Ibn al-Juwainī!” Regretting with the fact that he had been occupied with *kalām*, Abu ’l-Ma’ālī al-Juwainī, according to Ibn al-Jawzī, repented and lamented: “Do not be occupied with *kalām*! So, if you would know how *kalām* occupied me up to its highest point, you would not be occupied with it!”⁹¹⁸

[m.] *al-Tafriqa Bayn al-Īman wa ’l-Zandaqa*⁹¹⁹ and *Iḥyā’ ‘ulūm al-Dīn*⁹²⁰ by *Hujjat al-Islām Abū Ḥāmid al-Gazālī*

Al-Gazālī was born in Tūs in 450/1058. There he studied under the supervision of Imām Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Radāhānī. In 470/1077, he went to Nishāphūr and studied under the supervision of al-Juwainī for two years. In 484/1091 he was appointed professor in the Nizāmiyya College. He died on the 14th of *Jumāda II* 505 in Tūs, his birthplace.⁹²¹

The reason why al-Suyūṭī included al-Gazālī into the list of predecessors who were against *kalām* and why he abridged his work in SM, is presumably, first of all, that he was a professor and a great authority of Shafi’ite law in the Nizāmiyya College, where *kalām* and philosophy, according to Makdisi, were not admitted as part of curriculum.

Secondly, al-Suyūṭī even regarded al-Gazālī as the *mujaddid* of the 4th/10th century.⁹²² Al-Suyūṭī defends him against his opponents, who accused him of being influenced by the theological creeds of the Mu’tazilites and indebted to their logical instruments. According to al-Gazālī’s opponents, al-Suyūṭī says, Mu’tazilite influence was reflected in his work, *Tamhīd al-Arkān*.⁹²³ Asserting that al-Gazālī had spent his life refuting the Mu’tazilites and other sorts of innovations, al-Suyūṭī felt the urge to demolish such false accusations. In so

⁹¹⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 236-7.

⁹¹⁹The alternative title of this work, which is edited by Dr. Sulaymān Dunyā, is *Faysal al-Tafriqa bayn al-Islām wa ’l-Zandaqa* (Cairo: Dār Iḥyā’ al-Kutub al-‘Arabiyya, 1381/1961), 1st ed. The present author consults this edition to translate some passages quoted by al-Suyūṭī in his SM. The passages quoted in SM can be found on p. 202-4.

⁹²⁰For the discussion of al-Suyūṭī’s dealing with *Iḥyā’*, the present author consulted Abū Ḥāmid al-Gazālī’s *Iḥyā’ ‘Ulūm al-Dīn* (IU) (Cairo: al-Maṭba‘a al-Azhāriyya al-Miṣriyya, 1302/1885) 1st ed. The passages quoted by al-Suyūṭī in SM can be found in vol. I, p. 37.

⁹²¹M. Bouyges, *Essai de Chronologie des œuvres de al-Gazali (Algazel)* (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1959), p. 1-6.

⁹²²According to al-Suyūṭī, all the *mujaddids* revived in the centuries before ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-Azīz were of the shāfi’ite juridical denomination: al-Shāfi’ī, Abu ’l-‘Abbās b. al-Surayj, Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfara’īnī, Abū Ḥāmid al-Gazālī, Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Shaykh* Taqī al-Dīn b. Daqīq al-‘Id, etc. See *al-Tahadduth*, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

⁹²³Al-Suyūṭī, *al-Tahadduth*, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

doing, he composed two works, *Tashyīd al-Arkān* and *Daraj al-Ma‘alī fī Naṣrati ‘l-Gazālī ‘alā al-Munkir al-Mutagālī*.⁹²⁴

As suggested by Makdisi, al-Gazālī, moreover, was one of those who censured *kalām* vehemently. This was reflected by his words in *al-Tafriqa*: “The most excessive and extravagant people are a group among the *mutakallimūn* who accuse the laymen of the Muslims of being infidels. They claim that whoever does not know *kalām*, the way they do, and whoever does not know the evidence of the *shari‘a*⁹²⁵ together with the evidence which they have drawn up, is an infidel.”⁹²⁶

Furthermore, al-Gazālī remarks “If we would abandon hypocrisy and observe the side effects [of being occupied with *kalām*], we could declare that the involvement in *kalām* is prohibited because of a lot of evil, except for one of two persons: [The first person] is one to whom befalls doubt which will not leave his heart with the help of simple words (*kalām qarīb*) or with a tradition related from the Messenger...⁹²⁷ The second person is one possessing perfect intelligence, rooted belief in [his] religious faith, which has become firm due to the lights of the soul. He is desirous to deal with this occupation, so as to heal sickness, when doubt befalls him, and to silence the innovator – when the latter comes [to argue against] him. He is also to protect his belief, when an innovator intends to tempt him.”⁹²⁸

However, al-Gazālī concludes by saying: “Therefore it is known that a *mutakallim* who comes close to the present life and fights desperately for it, does not obtain the truth of the *ma‘rifā*. If he obtains it, he must certainly have shunned *dār al-gurūr*.”⁹²⁹

Al-Suyūtī also quotes some passages from *Iḥyā* which comply with his own agenda. The passages quoted, for instance, read: “The purpose of *kalām* is nothing but to protect the beliefs which the adherents of the *sunna* transmitted from the [pious] ancestors.”⁹³⁰ However when al-Gazālī became aware of its danger for the (common) people, he warned them not to be occupied with it, saying: “They regarded [*kalām*] as a defense of the faith and protection for the Muslims. But, actually it corrupts creatures and establishes innovation in their souls.”⁹³¹

As far as the pages of *al-Tafriqa* and *Iḥyā* which have been incorporated into SM are concerned, one thing is worth mentioning here: Al-Suyūtī took only three printed pages (p. 202-4) of the 85 printed pages of FT in the Dunyā edition (1962);

⁹²⁴Al-Suyūtī, *al-Taḥadduth*, *op. cit.*, p. 187-8; *Tashyīd al-Arkān man Laysa fi ‘l-Imkān Abda‘a minnā kāna* is preserved at the Mingana Collection in Birmingham (MS. No. 772 III) see www.idc.nl/faid/441faidb.html; MSS of *Tashyīd*, according to Brockelmann (GAL, G.II, 155, S. II, 196) were preserved in Cairo (ENL, Majāmi‘, 416), Rāmpūr, etc. So far, *Tashyīd al-Arkān* has not been edited yet. GAL is silent about *Daraj al-Ma‘alī*.

⁹²⁵The typing error also occurs in this place. *Al-adilla al-shar‘iyya* (in *Faysal al-Tafriqa* (FT), p.202) is rendered here as *al-‘aqā‘id al-shar‘iyya*.

⁹²⁶SM, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

⁹²⁷This is rendered from “...laysat tazūl bi kālam qarīb ‘an qalbih wa ‘azā wa lā bīhabar naqlīyyin ‘an rasūl...” (FT, p. 204). In SM, it reads “...laysat tazūl bikalām qarīb ‘an qalbih wa ‘azā wa lā bīhabar naqlīyyin ‘an rasūl...”

⁹²⁸Ibidem.

⁹²⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

⁹³⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

⁹³¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 237-243.

while he took only one printed page from the 1400 printed pages of the *Iḥyā*' in the 1885 edition.

[10]. The Debate between Abū Bishr Mattā b. Yūnus (256-328/870-940) and Abū Sa‘īd al-Sīrāfī (280-368/893-979)

Al-Suyūtī must have understood well that he was making use of the summary of the debate meant to illustrate the conflict between the proponents of Logic, an inheritance of the Greeks, and the partisans of the language of the Arabs. He must have adumbrated that Mattā represented his opponents,⁹³² while al-Sīrāfī represented the position he was defending in the face of his opponents. Judging from the contents of the debate, al-Suyūtī found in al-Sīrāfī a personality who presented himself as the champion of the truth of language, as well as one concerned with the fact that the instrument of the truth is ordinary language and the power of reasoning available to all men willing to apply themselves, and not Mattā's logic. The apparent motive of al-Suyūtī to incorporate this summary of the debate between Mattā and al-Sīrāfī is similar to that of the vizier Ibn al-Furāt, who asserted in his opening statements that Mattā's view of logic was contrary to religion as well as to the truth.

Furthermore, al-Suyūtī quoted the whole text of the debate which he had already incorporated in his much earlier work, QM.

[11]. The Learned Men's Refutation of those who Introduced Logic into *Uṣūl al-Fiqh*

Before concluding his discussion, al-Suyūtī put forth the remarks that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1254), Abū Shāma (d. 665/1268), al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277) and Ibn Taymiyya (d. 729/1329)⁹³³ refuted the introduction of logic into *uṣūl al-fiqh*. Because of fact that al-Suyūtī had discussed this before in his QM and JQ, he does not deal with their arguments against logic in this chapter.

In QM, however al-Suyūtī deals either, directly or indirectly, with their refutation of al-Gazālī's introduction of logic into *uṣūl al-fiqh*. According to al-Suyūtī, in his *Tabaqāt al-Nawawī* (676/1277), for instance, said that al-Gazālī's attempt to mingle logic with *uṣūl al-fiqh* was considered a heresy.⁹³⁴ Likewise, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1254) was of the opinion that as far as using "logical terms in formulating divine laws is concerned, it is one of the reprehensible actions and of new stupidities."⁹³⁵

Abū Shāma's implicit refutation of al-Gazālī's introduction of logic into *uṣūl al-fiqh* is found in al-Suyūtī's quotation of his words in Abū Shāma's *al-Tawakkul fī al-Radd ila 'l-Amr al-Awwāl*, namely that it is better to avoid the

⁹³²Contextually speaking, to the best of my knowledge, al-Suyūtī's opponents were the ones who claimed that mastering logic is one of the requirements of *ijtihād*.

⁹³³According to al-Nashshār, al-Gazālī's adoption of Aristotelian logic in his work on legal theory drew fervent criticism from a number of scholars of the traditionalist group, such as Abū Ishaq al-Marginānī (d. 513/1119), al-Qushayrī, al-Turṭūshī (d. 520/1127), al-Māzirī, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1246) and al-Nawawī (d. 631/1238). See al-Nashshār, *op. cit.*, p. 143-4.

⁹³⁴"*wa laqad atā bī ḥulṭīhī al-mantīq bi uṣūl al-fiqh bid'atan fī ḏammi shu'mihā 'ala 'l-manfa'a ḥattā kathura ba'da dhālikā fahm al-falsafa wa 'llāh al-musta'an.*" QM, p. 2, l. 9-11.

⁹³⁵Ibidem.

destructive effects and the logical complexities of *kalām* which drive people away from virtues.⁹³⁶

Ibn Taymiyya's refutation of al-Gazālī's introduction of logic into *uṣūl al-fiqh* is discussed in al-Suyūṭī's JQ. This is clearly indicated in IT's words, as quoted by al-Suyūṭī: "Those who introduced this [essential definition] are the ones who wrote on the principles of religion and law after Abū Ḥāmid [al-Gazālī] - towards the end of the fifth century - and it is they who have discoursed on definitions according to the doctrine of the Greek logicians. Scholars of all other denominations - the Ash'arīs, Mu'tazilis, Karrāmīs, Shī'is, and others - hold that the function of definition is to distinguish between the definiendum and other things. This is well-established in the writings of Abu 'l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī, al-Qādī Abū Bakr [al-Bāqillānī], Abū Ishaq [al-Isfara'inī], Ibn Fūrak, al-Qādī Abū Ya'lā, Ibn 'Aqīl, Imām al-Haramayn, Nasafī, Abū 'Alī [al-Jubbā'i], Abū Hāshim [al-Jubbā'i], 'Abd al-Jabbār, al-Tūsī, Muḥammad b. al-Hayṣam, and others."⁹³⁷ Accordingly, it is also reflected by IT's reference to al-Gazālī as the one who was responsible for spreading the logicians' method, through his inclusion in the beginning of his work *al-Mustaṣfā* of an introduction to Greek logic, and as the one who alleged that the learning of those who do not know this logic is not to be trusted.⁹³⁸

[12]. The Refutation of those who Introduced Logic into Grammar

Al-Suyūṭī then concludes his SM by discussing the refutation against those who introduced logic into grammar. In this regard, he refers to *Kitāb al-Masā'il* of the Imām Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ṣid al-Baṭalyawṣī (d. 531/1137).⁹³⁹ Apart from a minute quotation, al-Suyūṭī does not elaborate his discussion of *Kitāb al-Masā'il*. According to al-Suyūṭī, al-Baṭalyawṣī stated: "A discussion on grammatical questions occurred between him and a literary man. He started mentioning incessantly an accident (*al-maḥmūl*), a substance (*al-mawdū'*) and the logical expressions [which were related] to him: Metaphors and euphemisms are used in the art of Grammar but not by the logicians. The philosophers have said: It is obligatory to categorize every art according to the rules practiced by its experts. They have also been of the opinion that the mixing of one art with another is the result of the ignorance of the *mutakallim* or bears the purpose of

⁹³⁶"wa qad nabaga āḥarūn yarawna anna 'l-lawlā al-iqtisār 'alā nukath ḥilāfiyya waḍa'ūhā wa ashkāl manṭiqiyya allafūhā a'raḍū 'an al-maḥāsin wa sammū fuqaha'a 'l-madhab kawādin wa dhālikā min 'alāmati 'l-hudhālān na'ūdhū bi 'llāh min tadyī' al-zamān fi 'l-jidāl wa 'l-marā' wa nas'aluhū al-thabāt 'ala 'l-tamassuk bi 'l-athār." QM, p. 3, l. 24-6.

⁹³⁷JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 12-3.

⁹³⁸JQ (Hallaq), *op. cit.*, p. 111-12.

⁹³⁹Al-Suyūṭī gives al-Baṭalyawṣī's (b. 444/1053) biographical account in his BW, *op. cit.*, p. 218; According to Lévi-Provençal, al-Baṭalyawṣī was "a celebrated Andalusian grammarian and philosopher," who composed more than twenty works. He was born in Badajoz (Baṭalyaws) in 444/1052 and died in the middle of Rajab 521/end of July 1127 in Valencia." Lévi-Provençal, however, does not mention *Kitāb al-Masā'il*. GAL also remains silent about it, in spite of the fact that it deals with *Risāla fī Ru'ūs Masā'il al-Falsafa*. However, attention to it has been drawn by al-Nashshār, who said that *Kitāb al-Masā'il* is *al-Masā'il al-Manthūra fī 'l-Naḥw*. See GAL, I, 427, S. I, 758; Lévi-Provençal, E., "al-Baṭalyawṣī," in EI², I, 1092; SM, *op. cit.*, p. 255, n. 3 (N).

making an error and ease, by the transference from one art to another when the discourse against them is cornering them.”⁹⁴⁰

3.5. Conclusion

3.5.1. Analysis of the Sources

Two interesting things should be noted here with respect to al-Suyūṭī’s composition of SM. *First*, that he was a historian who arranged his topics very systematically. *Secondly*, that he attempted a prosopographical approach (borrowing Humprey’s and Van Ess’ term) to the sources he claimed to oppose logic and/or theology, in order to establish as many facts as possible about all those seemingly connected to a particular subject, and then to convert these facts into a collective portrait of this subject.⁹⁴¹ The aim of a prosopographical approach is closely connected to what Van Ess calls an attempt to provide ‘ein statistisches Bild.’⁹⁴² What al-Suyūṭī attempted in SM was to explain to his readers that theology and/or logic had been subjected to opposition by many leading scholars whose works he incorporated into SM.

However, the sources to which al-Suyūṭī refers as the opponents of logic and/or theology cannot be accepted at face value. Using Makdisi’s words, one ‘cannot dispense with a critical analysis of the prejudices of the sources.’⁹⁴³

Based on the death of their authors, the (written) sources which al-Suyūṭī made use of in composing SM can be set in the following chronological order:

1. *Al-Ri‘āya* by al-Muḥāsibī (d. 243/858)
2. a. *Al-Ta’rīh al-Kabīr*⁹⁴⁴
b. *Kitāb Ḥalq Af‘āl al-‘Ibād* by al-Buhārī (d. 256/870)
3. *Ta’wīl Muṣhkīl al-Qur’ān*⁹⁴⁵ by Ibn Qutayba al-Dīnawarī (d. 276/890)
4. *Musnad*⁹⁴⁶ by al-Dārimī (d. 282/895)
5. *Ṣarīḥ al-Sunnah*⁹⁴⁷ by al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923)
6. *Kitāb al-Shari‘a* by al-Ājurri (d. 360/972)
7. *Al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*⁹⁴⁸ by al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)⁹⁴⁹

⁹⁴⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 255-6.

⁹⁴¹Humphreys, *Islamic History*, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

⁹⁴²Van Ess, TG, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. ix.

⁹⁴³Makdisi exhorts scholars to be critical about the prejudices of the sources. Because this, according to him, is a fundamental principle of historical methodology, especially ‘when dealing with authors who belong not only to a religious movement but also to a particular group within this movement.’ Makdisi, ‘Hanbalite Islam,’ *op. cit.*, p. 228.

⁹⁴⁴GAS, I, 116, 132, 178, 319.

⁹⁴⁵Brockelmann refers to this work as *Muṣhkīlāt al-Qur’ān*. GAL, G. I, 120, S. I, 186.

⁹⁴⁶Brockelmann registers this work as *al-Musnad al-Jāmi‘*. GAL, G. I, 164, S.I, 270.

⁹⁴⁷GAS, I, 328.

⁹⁴⁸GAL, S. I, 279.

⁹⁴⁹Abu ’l-Qāsim Sulaymān b. Ayyūb b. Muṭṭayyir al-Lahmī al-Ṭabarānī, one of the most important traditionists of his age, became well-known for his three works on Tradition: *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr* (Beirut: 1983 in 10 vols.), *al-Mu‘jam al-Awsat* and *al-Mu‘jam al-Ṣagīr*. He was also the author of a number of other works: *Maṇāṣik Kitāb al-Sunnah*, *al-Radd ‘ala ’l-Mu‘tazila*, *Musnad Shu‘ba*, *Kitāb al-Nawādīt*, *Kitāb Dalā’il al-Nubuwwa*, etc. See Fierro, M., “al-Ṭabarānī,” in EI², X, 10.

8. The Debate between Abū Sa‘īd al-Sīrāfī (d. 368/979) and Mattā b. Yūnus (d. 328/940)
9. *Ta’rīħ Mīṣr*⁹⁵⁰ of Muḥammad b. Yūsuf b. Ya‘qub al-Kindī (d. 350/961)
10. *Qūt al-Qulūb* by Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī (d. 383/994)
11. *Ta’rīħ Mīṣr*⁹⁵¹ by Ibn Zūlāq al-Laythī (d. 387/997)⁹⁵²
12. *Al-Gunya ‘an al-Kalām*⁹⁵³ by al-Hatṭābī (d. 388/988)
13. *Sharḥ Uṣūl I’tiqād Ahl al-Sunna* by al-Lālakā’ī (d. 418/1028)
14. *Al-Ba’th wa ’l-Nushūr*⁹⁵⁴ by Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī al-Nīsabūrī (d. 458/1067)
15. *Sharaf Ašhāb al-Hadīth*⁹⁵⁵ by al-Hatṭāb al-Bagdādī (d. 463/1071)
16. *Jāmi‘ al-Bayān*⁹⁵⁶ by Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr al-Nimārī (d. 463/1071)
17. The Shafi‘ite al-Juwaynī (d. 478/1085)
18. *Dhamm al-Kalām wa Ahlīh*⁹⁵⁷ by Abū Ismā‘il al-Anṣārī al-Harawī (d. ca. 481/1089)
19. *Al-Hujja ‘alā Tārik al-Maḥajja* by the *Shayh* Naṣr al-Maqdisī (d. 490/1098)⁹⁵⁸
20. a. *Iḥyā ‘Ulūm al-Dīn*
 - b. *al-Tafriqa bayna ’l-Islām wa ’l-Zandaqa* by al-Gazālī (d. 505/1112)
21. *Kitāb al-Masā’iḥ*⁹⁵⁹ by ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Sīd al-Baṭalyawsī (d. 531/1138)
22. *Al-Milal wa ’l-Niḥal* by al-Shahrastānī (d. 548/1154)
23. a. *Dhayl Ta’rīħ Bagdād*⁹⁶⁰
 - b. *al-Intiṣār li Ahl al-Hadīth* by Ibn al-Samānī (d. 562/1166)
24. *Ta’rīħ Madīnat Dimashq*⁹⁶¹ by Ibn ‘Asākir (d. 571/1176)
25. *Talbīs al-Iblīs* by Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1201)
26. *Fatāwā* by Ibn al-Šalāh (d. 643/1254)
27. *Tabaqāt al-Fuqahā’*⁹⁶² by al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277)
28. *Naṣīḥat Ahl al-Īmān fī ’l-Radd ‘alā Manṭiq al-Yūnān* by Ibn Taymiyya (d. 729/1329)
29. *Tadhkira*⁹⁶³ by the Shafi‘ite Badr al-Dīn b. Jamā‘a (d. 733/1333)
30. The Shafi‘ite Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 744/1344)
31. *Sharḥ Lāmiyat al-‘Ājam*⁹⁶⁴ by al-Šalāh al-Šafadī (d. 746/1345)

⁹⁵⁰GAL, G. I, 149.

⁹⁵¹GAL, S.I, 230.

⁹⁵²Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Laythī, born in 306/919 and died in 386/996, was an Egyptian historian, the author of a number of biographical, historical and topographical works on Egypt in the time of Iḥsīdīd and early Fatimids. See Lewis, B., *et al.*, “Ibn Zūlāq,” in EI², III, 979.

⁹⁵³GAL, G. I, 165.

⁹⁵⁴GAL, S.I, 618-9.

⁹⁵⁵GAL, G. I, 329, S. I, 564.

⁹⁵⁶ GAL, G. I, 367.

⁹⁵⁷GAL, G. I, 433.

⁹⁵⁸This work was edited by Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm Hārūn as part of his thesis in the University of Madīna in 1409/1988.

⁹⁵⁹GAL, G. I, 427, S.I, 758.

⁹⁶⁰GAL, G.I, 330.

⁹⁶¹GAL, G. I, 331.

⁹⁶²Brockelmann refers to this work as *Tabaqāt al-Fuqahā’ al-Shāfi‘iyya*. GAL, G. I, 397.

⁹⁶³*Tadhkira al-Sāmi‘*. GAL, G. II, 75, S. II, 81.

32. a. *Al-Mīzān*⁹⁶⁵
 b. *Ta’rīh al-Islām*⁹⁶⁶
 c. *al-‘Ibar*⁹⁶⁷ by al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348)
 33. *Tabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyya*⁹⁶⁸ by Jamāl al-Dīn al-Asnawī (d. 772/1371)
 34. *Ta’rīh*⁹⁶⁹ by Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373)

The Arabic sources against logic and theology, some passages (or pages) of which are incorporated into SM, can be classified in two categories: *First*, the works which deal incidentally with the opposition to logic and/or theology; and *secondly*, those which deal explicitly and elaborately with that issue. No. 1, 2b, 5, 6, 10, 13, 15, 16, 20a, and 20b are works against theology, which can be classified into the first category. In these works, the censure of theology occupies only several paragraphs and/or a few pages. No. 12, 18, and 23b are the works in which the authors deal explicitly and elaborately with the opposition to theology.

The following works dealing explicitly with the opposition to logic are cited in SM: The discussion between Abū Sa‘id al-Sirāfī (d. 368/979) and Mattā b. Yūnus (d. 328/940) (no. 8),⁹⁷⁰ and *Nasīha* (no. 28). The *Fatāwā* (no. 26) only deals incidentally with the opposition to logic.

Why did al-Suyūṭī, in building up his arguments against his opponents in SM, only base himself on the works mentioned above? Why did he not, for instance, use *Tarjīh Asālib al-Qur‘ān ‘alā Asālib al-Yūnān* (against logic) by the Zaidite Ibn al-Wazīr al-Šan‘ānī (d. 840/1436) who, according to al-Nashshār, was influenced much in his composition by Ibn Taymiyya;⁹⁷¹ *al-Radd ‘alā Ahl al-Kalām* by al-Sulamī (d. 412/1022) and *Tahrīm al-Naṣar fī Kutub Ahl al-Kalām* by Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī (d. 620/1224) (both against theology);⁹⁷² *Miftāḥ Dār al-*

⁹⁶⁴ *Al-Gayth al-Musajjam fī Sharḥ Lāmiyat al-‘Ajām* is referred to by Brockelmann as *al-Gayth al-Musajjam* or *Gayth al-Adab alladhi ‘Nsajam*. GAL, S. I, 439-40.

⁹⁶⁵ *Mīzān al-I’tidāl fī Naqd al-Rijāl* (Cairo: Dār Ihyā’i ‘l-Kutub al-‘Arabiyya, 1963), ed. ‘Alī Muhammad al-Bijāwī, 4 vols. GAL, G. II, 47, S. II, 46.

⁹⁶⁶ GAL, G. II, 46.

⁹⁶⁷ *Al-‘Ibar fī Aḥbār al-Bashar mimman ‘Abar*. GAL, G. II, 47, S. I, 46.

⁹⁶⁸ GAL, G. II, 91.

⁹⁶⁹ Probably this refers to the most important of Ibn al-Kathīr’s works on the history of Islam, *al-Ābidāya wa ‘l-Nihāya*. On Ibn Kathīr, see Loust, H., “Ibn Kathīr,” in EI², III, 817-8; GAL, G. II, 49, S. II, 48.

⁹⁷⁰ D.S. Margoliouth edited the arabic text of the debate and translated it into English, ‘The Discussion between Abū Bishr Matta and Abū Sa‘id al-Sirāfī on the Merits of Logic and Grammar’ in JRAS, (London: 1905), 79-130. The text of this discussion can also be found in *al-Imtā‘ wa ‘l-Mu’ānasa* (Cairo: Lajna al-Ta’lif, 1953), ed. Ahmad Amīn and Ahmad al-Zayn, vol. I, p.107-128.

⁹⁷¹ *Manāhij*, op. cit., p. 223

⁹⁷² I failed to obtain information concerning the fact why al-Suyūṭī, when discussing the censure against *kalām*, did not refer to the Hanbalite Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī with his *Tahrīm al-Naṣar fī Kutub Ahl al-Kalām*, in spite of the fact that he dealt with Ibn Qudāma’s biography in his TH (p. 504). However, one may speculate about the fact that al-Suyūṭī could have regarded *Tahrīm* only as Ibn Qudāma’s personal criticism against his fellow muslim, a member of his own school, Ibn ‘Aqīl, as confirmed by one of the three titles for *Tahrīm*, i.e. *Kitāb fīh al-Radd ‘alā Ibn ‘Aqīl*, (Makdisi, op. cit., p. xi) and, hence, it is plausible that al-Suyūṭī thought it unsignificant for his discussion.

*Sa‘āda*⁹⁷³ by the Hanbalite Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 751/1351) and *Kasr al-Manṭiq* by the Shi‘ite Abu ’l-Najā al-Farīd (both against logic)?

One might suggest two answers to this question: *First*, that al-Suyūtī did not have at his disposal any other works against logic and/or theology than the ones discussed in SM, presumably as a result of their limited circulation. *Secondly*, as an apologist, al-Suyūtī had to refine his arguments by selecting his sources in such a manner that he would convince his opponents. Probably, it is the second answer which deserves more affirmation for two obvious reasons.

First of all, in his autobiographical work, *al-Taḥadduth bi Ni‘mati ‘llāh*, al-Suyūtī maintains that all the *mujaddids* of preceding centuries, apart from ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz,⁹⁷⁴ were of the Shafī‘ite juridical school: Al-Shāfi‘ī, Abu ’l-‘Abbās b. al-Surayj, Abū Hāmid al-Isfara‘īnī, Abū Hāmid al-Gazālī, Faḥr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, the *Shaykh* Taqī al-Dīn b. Daqīq al-‘Id and Sirāj al-Dīn al-Bulqīnī.⁹⁷⁵ This is confirmed by Hallaq, who suggests that nearly all of the jurists bearing the task of *tajdīd* were Shafī‘ites.⁹⁷⁶ In the second place, attention should also be paid to the fact that eleven out of thirteen authors whose works were abridged in SM were affiliated to the Shafī‘ite juridical school,⁹⁷⁷ despite the fact that al-Suyūtī mentions only their being prominent leading figures (*a’imma*).⁹⁷⁸

By composing SM, Al-Suyūtī demonstrated to his adversaries that he was deeply knowledgeable about the origin and the foundation of logic, the history of its introduction into the religious community of Islam, the origin of the connection to logic of the books of *uṣūl al-fiqh* and *uṣūl al-dīn*, and the beginning of its spread among later scholars. He also wanted to tell his adversaries that not a single science could escape his attention, including logic, because he was “the greatest scholar of his time,”⁹⁷⁹ thereby proving that he possessed the necessary conditions to fulfill his ambition to be qualified as a renewer (*mujaddid*) of tenth/sixteenth century.⁹⁸⁰ Finally he showed that all the preceding

⁹⁷³Although al-Suyūtī did not mention this work in SM, he deals with it in his biographical work, *Bugyat al-Wu‘āt* when discussing its author. See al-Suyūtī, BW, (Cairo: Matba‘a al-Sa‘āda, 1326/1908), 1st ed., p. 25.

⁹⁷⁴In asserting the central role of Shafī‘ism among the revivers, al-Suyūtī suggests that ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, as the first reviver, shares al-Shāfi‘ī’s being a member of the Prophet’s family (*min ḥalī rasūl allāh*). See *al-Taḥadduth*, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 217.

⁹⁷⁵‘Wa wajadnā jami‘a man qīla innahū māb‘ūth fī ra’s kullī mi‘a mīmmā tamadhhaba bimadhhab al-shāfi‘ī wa inqādi liqawlih, ‘alimnā annahū al-imām al-māb‘ūth alladhī ‘staqarra amr al-nās ‘alā qawlih, wabu‘itha ba‘dah fī ra’s kullī mi‘a man yuqarrir madhhbabah.’ See *al-Taḥadduth*, *op. cit.*, p. 218; This topic was also dealt with by Goldziher in “Zur Charakteristik Ḡelāl ud-dīn us-Sujūtī’s und seiner literarischen Thätigkeit,” G.S. I (1967), 52–73.

⁹⁷⁶Hallaq, W.B., *The Gate of Ijtihad: A Study in Islamic Legal History*. Ph.D. Diss. University of Washington (University Microfilms International, 1983), p. 79.

⁹⁷⁷The two who are of non-Shafī‘ite denomination are al-Harawī (Hanbalite) and ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-Barr (Malikite).

⁹⁷⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

⁹⁷⁹Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

⁹⁸⁰In the last two chapters of his books, respectively *mā an’ama ‘llāh bihi ‘alayya min al-tabāḥḥuri fi l-‘ulūm wa bulūgi ratbatī l-ijtihād* and *dhikr al-māb‘ūthīn ‘alā ra’si kullī mi‘a*, one can clearly find al-Suyūtī’s explicit ambition to be qualified as *mujaddid* of the tenth century of Hijra. This is reflected in his last words in this book: “qultu wa qad

mujaddids, and the Shafi‘ite *madhhab* in general, fiercely opposed logic and *kalām*.

3.5. 2. Al-Suyūtī’s Sources against *Kalām*

Although al-Suyūtī’s motivation to compose SM was markedly to prove that he mastered logic better than his opponents,⁹⁸¹ his discussion also emphasizes *kalām*. He incorporates in it twelve works he claimed to be against *kalām*. It seems, however, that the apologetic nature of SM lies in the sense that it was intended to defend his claim to be the *mujaddid* of the tenth century of Hijra in the face of his adversaries, who questioned his expertise in logic. Thus, the accuracy of the identification of particular historical figures as being in favour of al-Suyūtī’s claims apparently was not always so important as the prominence of these historical figures themselves. Especially when questioning al-Suyūtī’s inclusion of al-Juwainī, who was deeply connected to the school of *‘ilm al-kalām* inaugurated by Abu ‘l-Hasan al-Ash‘arī and whose deepest influence on Muslim thought was due to his role in *kalām*, one finds one more indication of the apologetic nature of SM.

Nevertheless, SM remains an important source which enables us to find clues for the development of the ideas of the opponents of *kalām*.

Referring to a number of (written) sources, in SM al-Suyūtī discusses how speculative reasoning, *kalām*, was rejected and opposed by Muslims since the period of the Companions, the forerunners of the Jurists among the Followers, the third generation, such as ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, Muslim b. Yasār, Ibrāhīm al-Naḥa’i, Abū Qulāba, Yaḥya b. Abī Kathīr, Sulaymān b. Dāwūd, Yaḥya b. Sa‘īd, Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik and ‘Amr b. Qays, and then the fourth generation such as Ishāq b. ‘Isā, Mālik b. Anas, Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, Sufyan al-Thawrī, ‘Abd Allāh b. Dāwūd al-Huraybī, Abū Ishāq al-Fazārī, Ḥasan b. ‘Atiyya, al-Awza‘ī, al-Fudayl b. ‘Iyād, Abū Ja‘far al-Nāfilī, Sa‘īd b. Abī Marḥam, Shu‘ba, Salām b. Abī Muṭī‘, Aḥmad b. Mahdī and Ya‘qūb b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Májishūn, and so on until the ninth generation which includes, to mention only some, Yaḥyā b. ‘Ammār, Muḥammad b. ‘Umar, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn, al-Ḥusayn b. Shu‘ayb, etc. He also discusses the censure of *kalām* by a number of prominent historical figures ranging from al-Shāfi‘ī, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Mālik b. Anas, Imām al-Buhārī, Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī, Abū Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Ḥattābī, Abu ‘l-Qāsim b. Manṣūr al-Lālakā’ī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ājurrī, Abū Ṭalib al-Ḥārithī al-Makkī, Abū ‘Umar Yūsuf b. ‘Abd al-Barr al-Nimārī, al-Ḥaṭīb al-Bagdādī, and Imām al-Haramayn al-Juwainī to al-Gazālī.⁹⁸²

Discussing the names of the opponents of *kalām* mentioned above, al-Suyūtī also tells us about the variety of their arguments concerning *kalām*. He explains to us, for instance, how the authors of *kalām* in the first generation, the

sahha qawluhū: “yaḥtamīlu an yabqā tāsi‘ ‘alā ra’si l-tāsi‘a...”, *fanaḥnu lān fi sanat sitta wa tis‘in wa thamani mī‘a wa lam yajī’ al-mahdī wa lā ‘īsa wa lā ashrāṭa dhālikā. Wa qad tarajjā al-faqīr min fāḍlī llāh an yun‘ama ‘alayhī bikawnihī huwa al-mujaddid ‘alā ra’si l-mī‘a wa mā dhālikā ‘ala llāh bi ‘azīz.” See al-Suyūtī, *al-Tahadduth*, *op. cit.*, p. 227.*

⁹⁸¹This was asserted by al-Suyūtī himself in the introduction of SM. See SM, *op. cit.*, p. 33-

4:

⁹⁸²Ali, *op. cit.*, (2005), p. 1-25.

Companions of the Prophet, were excluded from the community and no one was allowed by the authorities to befriend him. Abridging al-Harawī's work, al-Suyūtī also leads us to understand how the authors of the innovations in the second generation, the forerunners of the jurists among the Followers, were considered to be the followers of the Dajjal and found themselves living with Jews and Christians. In the following generation, the third one, the authors of *kalām* are said to have been avoided because they were exercising evil influence on others and lead them astray. In the fourth generation, the authors of *kalām* were identified by its opponents with those who had been destined by God to commit evil and from whose hearts the light of Islam had been blotted out. In the following generation, the fifth one, the argument posed by the opponents of *kalām* against the authors of *kalām* was interestingly exemplified by the story of Abū Ḥanīfa who was asked about *a'rād* (accidents) and *ajsām* (substances) and said that both of them were the affair of philosophers. It was further interestingly exemplified by Abū Yūsuf's identification of the author of *kalām* with atheists. An interesting tendency of the arguments against *kalām* in the following generation, the sixth one, was embodied in al-Shāfi'i's fervently hostile attitude against *kalām*, which was reflected by his words that the heads of the authors of *kalām* should be beaten with a palm-stalk, and that they should be driven away from their homeland. The arguments which seem to represent the basic foundation of the opponents of *kalām* can be discerned in the members of the seventh generation of the opponent of *kalām*, especially in Ayyūb al- Saḥtiyānī's statements that one is not to dispute with people on a matter one does not know about, because this leads one to corruption. The diversity of the arguments of the opponents of *kalām* in the eighth generation can be seen in the identification of *kalām* with astrology, in the sense that they both lead to ignorance. The arguments of the ninth generation of the opponents of *kalām* was marked by the words of Yahyā b. 'ammār, stating that the books on *kalām* should be burnt.⁹⁸³

In his attempt to give his readers the impression that *kalām* was also subjected to fervent opposition from a great number of prominent individuals, al-Suyūtī incorporates a number of works against *kalām* in his SM. The first is *Kitāb Dhāmm I'lām al-Kalām wa Ahlīh* by al-Harawī. The significance of this work for this kind of study is highlighted by al-Suyūtī's remark that this book is the most excellent work on the rejection of *kalām*. Every single piece of information is given with its chains of transmission.⁹⁸⁴

Al-Ri'āya by al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī is another work abridged by al-Suyūtī. Arnaldez concluded that this work is al-Muḥāsibī's masterpiece, as it is the longest and most comprehensive of his writings.⁹⁸⁵ This work discusses the eagerness of the people to debate and to argue as well as to refute the adherents of different religions. The author, according to al-Suyūtī, was a leading scholar in the field of jurisprudence, *tasawwuf*, tradition, *kalam*, *zuhd*, *wara'* and *ma'ārif*. He was included by *al-Ustādh* Abū Maṣ'ūr al-Tamīmī in the first generation of the companions of al-Shāfi'i.⁹⁸⁶

⁹⁸³Ali, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

⁹⁸⁴Suyuti, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

⁹⁸⁵Arnaldez, "al-Muhasibi," in EI², VII, p. 124.

⁹⁸⁶Suyuti, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

Kitāb Ḥalq Afāl al-‘Ibād by al-Buhārī is also indispensable for the identification of the opponents of *kalām*. This work provides a number of narrations censuring debate, argumentation and *kalām*. This is exemplified in the narration of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal and other scholars, who appear to have hated inquiring and scrutinizing ambiguous matters of faith and did not mingle with the *mutakallimūn*.⁹⁸⁷

Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī’s *Sarih al-Sunna* is likewise referred to by al-Suyūṭī in his discussion against *kalām*. In this work, al-Ṭabarī relates some events that occurred after the death of the Prophet, such as the dispute among the *umma* about those who among them is most entitled to the leadership and the caliphate, the dispute on whether [the deeds of the worshippers] are determined by the *qadā’* of God and His *qadar* or whether this question is determined by the people; then follows the dispute on the Koran, viz. whether it was created or not, and on the Divine vision of the believers in the Day of Resurrection. Al-Ṭabarī considered all these disputes as stupidities which only occupied people of ignorance and enmity. In concluding his discussion, he quotes the words of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal stating that he who says that the Koran was created is a Jahmite; and he who says that it is not created, is an innovator.⁹⁸⁸

Al-Haṭṭābī’s *al-Gunya ‘an al-Kalām* (which is no longer extant) also discusses the opposition to *kalām*: “We neither refute the rational evidence nor its competence to lead us to knowledge. But when using them, we do not follow the method which you applied during the establishment of the argument with the help of the accidents and in referring these accidents to the essences as well as in the transformation of these accidents into the essences for [understanding] the creation of the Universe and the existence of the Creator. We dislike the usage of such a method [by turning to] something for which the clearest evidence and soundest demonstration exist. Because that is a matter which you take from the philosophers and according to which you followed them. The philosophers apply this method, only because they neither affirm the prophethood nor believe that the truth has already been born in [the prophethood]. The strongest argument affirming these affairs, in their opinion, is what they deduced from these things.”⁹⁸⁹

Sharḥ Uṣūl I’tiqād Ahl al-Sunna wa I-Jamā’ā by al-Lālakā’ī is replete with the condemnation of dispute and *kalām*. Al-Lālakā’ī, for instance, states that it is obligatory to refrain from innovations and from listening to what is innovated by those who lead people astray. Elsewhere, he states that the first innovation was the dispute on *al-qadar* about which ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar was asked. The Prophet commanded people to confirm the *qadar*, to believe in it and to refrain from disputing on it.⁹⁹⁰

In his *Sharḥ*, al-Lālakā’ī also lists a great number of persons whom he considered to belong to the *Ahl al-Sunna*. That number includes the first generation (the Companions of the Prophet), the second generation (the Followers), the third generation (the Followers of the Followers), as well as people

⁹⁸⁷SM, *op. cit.*, p. 131-2.

⁹⁸⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 136-7.

⁹⁸⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 140-1.

⁹⁹⁰SM, *op. cit.*, p. 148-150.

from among the residents of Mecca, Syria and Palestine (*al-Shām*), Mesopotamia, Egypt, Rayy, Mosul, Kūfa, Baṣra, Bagdad and Ṭabaristān.⁹⁹¹

Al-Shārī'a by al-Ājurri is also replete with the condemnation of debate and argumentation in matters of religion. The author, first of all, provides a number of traditions and words of the Ancestors, who condemned *kalām*, debate and argumentation. He then lists a number of personalities who censured *kalām*: Ma'ān b. 'Isā, Hishām b. Ḥasan, 'Abd al-Karīm al-Jazarī, Ayyūb al-Saḥtiyānī, al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz.⁹⁹²

In his *Jāmi'* *al-Bayān*, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr discusses two topics: the haufulness of debate and argumentation; and the condemnation of speculation about matters of belief in God based on personal opinion and analogy without a textual foundation. Like other scholars of tradition, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr discusses the censure of debate, argumentation and *kalām* by his predecessors which revolves around the following points: (a) That one who subjects his religion to altercation, is likely to move from one religion to another (which implies *ridda*); (b) that one has to avoid argumentation, because it nullifies the religious practices; (c) *Kalām* on matters of religion is rejectable; (d) The scholars of tradition and jurisprudence reached a consensus that the scholars of *kalām* are innovators and cheaters. He then lists a number of personalities who condemned debate, argumentation and *kalām*: 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz, Mu'āwiyya b. 'Amr, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyā, Ibn 'Abbās, Mālik b. Anas, Abū 'Amr, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, etc.⁹⁹³

Sharaf Aṣḥāb al-Hadīth of al-Ḥatīb al-Bagdādī was incorporated in SM because it could serve al-Suyūtī's objective in his mission against *kalām*: Al-Bagdādī discusses the condemnation of *kalām* by a number of scholars: Ishāq b. 'Isā, Mālik b. Anas, Sufyān al-Thawrī, al-Faḍl b. Ziyād, al-Awzā'i, Yazīd b. Zarī', Muḥammad b. al-'Abbās al-Ḥazzāz, Abū Mazāhim al-Ḥaqqānī.

In *al-Intiṣār li Ahl al-Hadīth* by Ibn al-Sam'ānī (which is no longer extant), we can read the author's discussion of the condemnation of *kalām* by a number of personalities: Sa'īd b. Ḥamīd, Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfi'i, Sufyān al-Thawrī, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī, etc. He quotes, for instance, the words of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal on *kalām*, that the authors of *kalām* are atheists. He also explains the attitude of Sufyān al-Thawrī towards *kalām*, as it is exemplified in his statement saying: 'you should be in line with *athar*, and beware of dispute on God and his Attributes.'⁹⁹⁴

The last main sources, incorporated by al-Suyūtī into SM, are some passages of *al-Tafriqa* and *Iḥyā'* by al-Gazālī. These works reflect al-Gazālī's deep-seated distrust of the art of disputation. In speaking against *kalām*, Makdisi maintains, al-Gazālī marshals evidence of its harmful character from the dicta of the great leaders among the doctors of the law: Shāfi'i, Mālik b. Anas, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Abū Ḥanifa, Sufyān al-Thawrī, and others. Al-Gazālī, for instance, cites the second Caliph 'Umar b. al-Ḥaṭṭāb and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal as those who closed the gate of *kalām* and dispute.⁹⁹⁵

⁹⁹¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 161-5.

⁹⁹²SM, *op. cit.*, p. 170-1.

⁹⁹³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 182-8.

⁹⁹⁴SM, *op. cit.*, p. 200-1.

⁹⁹⁵Makdisi, "The Non-Ash'arite...", *op. cit.*, p. 239-257.

Interestingly, al-Juwaynī is also referred to by al-Suyūṭī as the one who repented from his occupation with *kalām*. Despite al-Suyūṭī's reference to Ibn al-Sam'ānī's *Ta'rih*, Ibn al-Jawzī's *Talbīs Iblīs* and al-Asnawī's *Tabaqāt*, al-Juwaynī's argument(s) against *kalām* are incorporated in SM and treated in the same way as al-Suyūṭī does with the arguments of the scholars whose works are explicitly directed against *kalām*.

Chapter Four

Al-Suyūtī's *Fatwā* against Logic:⁹⁹⁶ Its Manuscript and its Content as well as its Sources

Of the four works against logic and theology, al-Suyūtī's *Fatwā* was composed the last. This is clearly indicated by a passage which says "...and [then followed] al-Taqī b. Taymiyya who composed a big volume to condemn logic and undo its foundations, entitled *Naṣīḥat Dhawi l-Imān fī l-Radd 'alā Manṭiq al-Yūnān* which I have summarized in one third of its length. [Also] I have composed a volume to condemn logic, in which I collected the statements against it of the learned men..."⁹⁹⁷ The abridgement of Ibn Taymiyya's *Naṣīḥat* to one third of its length mentioned above is JQ; and the volume which was composed by al-Suyūtī against logic, of course, points to no other work than SM,⁹⁹⁸ in which al-Suyūtī marshalled the arguments against logic of more than 36 scholars of various juridical denominations.

This chapter will deal with the manuscript of the *Fatwā*, al-Suyūtī's legal opinion discussed in it and the evaluation of the sources on which al-Suyūtī relies in his discussion against logic.

4.1. The Manuscript of the *Fatwā*

Although Brockelmann lists this manuscript under the title *al-Qawl al-Mushriq fī Tahrīm al-Ishtigāl bi 'Ilm al-Manṭiq*,⁹⁹⁹ the present author refers to it as al-Suyūtī's *Fatwā*. This is based on a colophon found at the end of QM which reads: "waqaftu 'alā fatwā bi-nafs al-ism [i.e. *al-Qawl al-Mushriq*] fī kitābih al-ḥāwī li l-fatwā. Aftā bihā ba'da kitābat hādhīh al-risāla wadhakarāhā fīhā fatabayyana li anna tasmiyatahā bināfīs al-tasmiya galāt min aḥad al-nussāḥ. Fahiya lā tūjadu kadhālikā fī jāmī' al-nusah al-maḥṭūṭa li l-ḥāwī."

The manuscript of this *Fatwā* is preserved at the Egyptian National Library (Dār al-Kutub, Majāmi' Qawwāla 25).¹⁰⁰⁰ It consists of three pages. Each page consists of 27 lines, each of which has about 8-9 words. This manuscript, as stated at the end of the passage, was copied by al-Sayyid Maḥmūd on Friday 24th of Jumāda I 1115/1704.

This *fatwā* has been edited and published in a collection of *fatwās* by al-Suyūtī, entitled *al-Ḥāwī li'l-Fatwā* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1993).

⁹⁹⁶I am grateful to Dr. N.J.G. Kaptein, the Director of INIS (Indonesian-Nederland Cooperation in Islamic Studies) in Leiden and Dr. Nursamad Kamba, the Educational Attaché of the Indonesian Republic in Cairo, for providing me with a copy of this manuscript.

⁹⁹⁷"...wa l-taqī b. taymiyya wa allafā fī dhāmmih wa naṣṣa qawā'idah mujalladan kabīran sammāh naṣīḥat dhawī l-imān fī l-radd 'alā manṭiq al-yūnān waqad iḥtaṣartuh fī naḥw thulth ḥajmīh wa allaftu fī dhāmm al-manṭiq mujalladan saqtu fīh nuṣūṣ al-a'imma fī dħālikā..." *Fatwā* of al-Suyūtī, Dār al-Kutub, Majāmi' Qawwāla 25, fol. 328a.

⁹⁹⁸Also because al-Suyūtī himself refers to QM as a *kurrāsa*. SM is a small volume.

⁹⁹⁹GAL, I, 189.

¹⁰⁰⁰Sartain, *op. cit.* p. 220.

4.2. The Contents of the *Fatwā*

Reading al-Suyūṭī's own statement, one understands that this treatise was written in answer to a question about the study of logic and the status of the knowledge of logic as a condition of undertaking *ijtihād*. This can be obviously understood from al-Suyūṭī's words: "...wa l-ḥaṣil anna hādhā al-rajul alladhi ṣadarat 'anhu hādhīhi al-maqāl rajulun galaba 'alayh al-jahūl wa l-ḥamq, wa l-fisq fa l-wājib 'alā al-muhtāṭ lidīnīh an yahjurah fī llāh ta 'alā..."

a. The Question

Without giving any information about the identity of the questioner, al-Suyūṭī opens his *fatwā* with the recital of *al-basmalah*. He then says that the question he wants to answer concerns the statements by al-Gazālī who claimed to be a *fāqīh*, which revolve around the fact that (1) declaring the oneness of God depends on the knowledge of logic, (2) the study of logic is an individual obligation, (3) studying every detail of the science of logic brings about ten virtues (*ḥasanāt*),¹⁰⁰¹ (4) the issuing of a legal opinion without knowledge of logic is not valid.

b. The Answer

Before responding to the statements attributed to al-Gazālī one by one, al-Suyūṭī first of all states that logic is an evil and censured art (*fān ḥabīth madhmūm*); that being occupied with it is prohibited; that logic leads one into philosophy and heresy; and that it bears no religious benefit at all. Furthermore, he proceeds to say that one who states that logic is an individual obligation, should take into account that studying the sciences of interpretation (*tafsīr*) and Tradition (*ḥadīth*), which are the most virtuous sciences, is not an individual but a social obligation. The view that logic is an individual obligation must belong to an infidel or an innovator. While the opinion that confessing of the Oneness of God depends on the knowledge of logic is the worst lie of all.

Al-Suyūṭī then adds that one who believes that logic is useful and bears any truth must be ignorant of it. He should be taught that the demonstrations (*barāhīn*) of logic are built on the generalities (*kulliyāt*) which do not exist in reality and do not denote the existence of any particularity.

Then al-Suyūṭī maintains that a person who says that confessing the Oneness of God depends on the knowledge of logic, in spite of his own ignorance of logic, must be considered an infidel. Al-Suyūṭī then argues that to be a believer does not necessarily mean to know the principles of logic, because in one's conscience or heart is imprinted the ability to imply or observe the fact that the stars, the day and the night, for instance, belong to the Creator. Even the imitators (*muqallidūn*) know this fact automatically without having to know the principles of logic.

All these derogatory remarks on logic have been ascribed by al-Suyūṭī to a number of leading scholars whom he himself grouped into the following juridical schools:

¹⁰⁰¹"wa inna lata 'allumahū bikulli ḥarf 'ashr ḥasanāt..." p. alif.

The Shafi‘ites	The Malikites	The Hanafites	The Hanbalites
1. Al-Shāfi‘ī (d. 203/820)	28. Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī (d. 383/994)	40. Abū Sa‘id al-Sīrāfī (d. 368/979)	42. Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1201) ¹⁰⁰²
2. Abū Naṣr b. al-Qushayrī (d. 469/1077) ¹⁰⁰³	29. Ibū Abī Zayd (d. ca.386/997) ¹⁰⁰⁴	41. Sirāj al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī (d. 750/1349)	43. Sa‘d al-Dīn al-Hārithī (d. 710/1311) ¹⁰⁰⁵
3. Ibū al-Šabbāg (d. 477/1085) ¹⁰⁰⁶	30. Abū al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥaṣṣār (d. 392/1003) ¹⁰⁰⁷		44. Ibū Taymiyya (d. 729/1329)
4. Al-Juwainī (d. 478/1085)	31. Abū ’l-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥabīb al-Nīsabūrī (d. 406/1016) ¹⁰⁰⁸		
5. Naṣr al-Maqdisī (d. 490/1098) ¹⁰⁰⁹	32. Abū al-Walīd al-Bājī (d. 474/1081) ¹⁰¹⁰		

¹⁰⁰²Jamāl al-Dīn Abu ’l-Faraj ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Alī b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Qurashī al-Bukrā was born ca. 510/1117. He was a disciple of 87 scholars, among whom were Ibū al-Ḥiṣṣīn, Abū Gālib b. al-Bannā’, al-Faḥr ‘Alī. He was the author *Zād al-Masīr, Jāmi‘ al-Masānid, al-Mugnī, Tadhkīrat al-Arīb, Talqīḥ Fuhūm al-Athār*, etc. He was referred to by al-Suyūtī as “*al-Imām al-‘Allāma al-Hāfiẓ ‘Ālam al-’Irāq wa Wā’iz al-Āfāq*.” He died on 13 Ramaḍān 597/1201. See al-Suyūtī, TH, 477-8.

¹⁰⁰³Abū Naṣr, a son of al-Qushayrī, the author of *al-Risāla*, was referred to by al-Subkī as *Imām al-Ā’imma wa Ḥabr al-Amr*. He studied under his father, ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Qushayrī, and then under Imām al-Haramayn. He became a lecturer in Nizāmiyya College. He died on Friday 18 Jumāda II 469/1077. See al-Suyūtī, TS, III, 149-50; Halm, H., “al-Kushayrī,” EI², V, 527.

¹⁰⁰⁴Abū Muḥammad ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Zayd al-Mālikī, died in ca. 386/997), was referred to by al-Qummī as *wāsi‘ al-’ilm kathīr al-hifz wa ḥ-riwāya*. See al-Qummī, KA, I, 191.

¹⁰⁰⁵The Chief Judge Sa‘d al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad Maṣūd b. Aḥmad al-Hārithī al-’Irāqī was born in Irak in 652/1255 and died in 710/1311 in Egypt. See al-Suyūtī, HM, I, 358.

¹⁰⁰⁶According to al-Subkī, Ibū al-Šabbāg was the *kunya* of Abū Naṣr ‘Abd al-Sayyid b. Abī Tāhir Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Wāhid b. Muḥammad al-Bagdādī, who was born ca. 400 and died on Tuesday 13 Jumāda I 477/1085. He studied under the *Qādī* Abū al-Ṭayyib and the Shayh Abū Ishāq. In 459/1068, he was appointed professor at Nizāmiyya college (al-Subkī, TS, II, 39-40). According to al-Qummī, he was the author of a number of books, *al-Shāmil*, the best book in jurisprudence in which references and evidence are highly reliable, *Tadhkīrat al-’Ālim, al-Tārīq al-Salīm*, etc (al-Qummī, KA, I, 330-1).

¹⁰⁰⁷Abū ’l-Ḥasan Aḥmad b. Sa‘id b. Muḥammad b. Bishr b. al-Ḥaṣṣār was the father of the Judge Abū al-Muṭarrif b. Bishr. He studied under Qāsim b. Aṣbag, Ibū Abī Daylam, Musallama b. Qāsim, Ḥālid b. Sa‘id, Muḥammad b. Isā and died in 392/1003. See al-Qādī ’Iyād, TMM, II, 678.

¹⁰⁰⁸Makdisi, *The Rise of Humanism*, op. cit., p. 44, n. 25.

¹⁰⁰⁹Naṣr b. Ibrāhīm b. Naṣr b. Ibrāhīm b. Dāwud al-Maqdisī, died on Tuesday 9 Muḥarram 490/1098, according to al-Subkī, was the author of a number of works: *al-Intihāb al-Dimashqī* (10 vols.), *al-Hujja ‘alā Tārik al-Mahajja, al-Tahdhīb, al-Maqṣūd, al-Kāfi, Sharḥ al-Ishāra*, etc. He studied under several scholars, among whom were ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Tubayz, ‘Alī b. al-Simsār, Muḥammad b. ‘Auf al-Mizzī and Ibū Salwān. See al-Subkī, TS, V, 351-3.

6. al-Gazālī (d. 505/1111)	33. Abū Bakr al-Turtūshī (d. 520/1127) ¹⁰¹¹		
7. Ibn ‘Asākir (d. 571/1176) ¹⁰¹²	34. <i>al-Qādī</i> Abū Bakr b. al-‘Arabī (d. 543/1148) ¹⁰¹³		
8. al-Silafī (d. 576/1180)	35. Abū Ḥabīb al-Mālaqī (d. 640/1243)		
9. ‘Imād al-Dīn b. Yūnus (d. 608/1212) ¹⁰¹⁴	36. Abū ‘Āmir b. Rabī‘ ¹⁰¹⁵		
10. Ibn Bundār (d. 622/1226) ¹⁰¹⁶	37. Ibn Abī Ḥamza (d. 695/1296) ¹⁰¹⁷		

¹⁰¹⁰According to Dunlop, Abu ‘l-Walīd Sulaymān b. Halaf al-Bājī, born in 403/1012 in Beja (now in South of Portugal), was famous as a distinguished theologian and literary figure in the 11th century of Spain. He was the author of a number of works, among which the following were held in high estimation: *Sharḥ al-Muwatṭa* and *Risāla fī Ḥudūd*. He died at Almeria in 474/1081. See Dunlop, D.M., “al-Bādjī,” EI², III, 545; *al-Qādī* ‘Iyād, TMM II, 343-4.

¹⁰¹¹Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Walid al-Fihri al-Turtūshī studied under Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Shāshī, Abū ‘Alī Aḥmad b. ‘Alī al-Tustarī, Abū ‘Umar al-Hāshimī, etc. He was referred to by al-Sam‘ānī as *imāman faqīhan sāliḥan sadīd al-sīra*. See al-Imām Abū Sa‘id ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Muḥammad b. Maṇṣūr al-Tamīmī al-Sam‘ānī, *al-Ansāb*, IV, 62.

¹⁰¹²The Shafi‘ite Abu ‘l-Qāsim ‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan b. Hibat Allāh b. al-Ḥusayn al-Dimashqī, born in 499/1106, studied tradition under the supervision of his father. For his study, he then travelled to Bagdad, Kūfa, Nīsābūr, Merv, Herāt, etc, where he frequented 1300 leading scholars. He was the author of more than 10 works, among which *Ta’rīḥ Dimashq*, *Aṭrāf al-Sunan al-Arba‘a*, *‘Awālī Mālik*, *Fadl Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth*, *Maṇāqib al-Shubbān*, *Ta’rīḥ al-Mijja*, etc. Al-Suyūṭī regarded him *al-Imām all-Kabīr ḥāfiẓ al-Shām*. He died on 11 Rajab 571/1176. See al-Suyūṭī, TH, 474-5.

¹⁰¹³Ibn al-‘Arabī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ma‘āfirī was “a traditionist belonging to Seville.” He was born in 468/1076 Seville and died in Fez. His reputation as a *qādī* lies in his “severity towards evildoers and kindness towards humble people.” He was the author of a number of works, among which is *Āridā al-Āhwadhī*, “a commentary on al-Tirmidhī’s collection of traditions.” See Robson, J., “Ibn al-‘Arabī,” EI², III, 707.

¹⁰¹⁴The *Shayḥ* ‘Imād al-Dīn b. Yūnus al-Irbilī, Muḥammad b. Yūnus b. Muḥammad b. Maṇā‘a b. Mālik, born in 535/1141 and died in 608/1212, was referred to by al-Subkī as *Imām waqtih fī ḥadīth wa iṣṭiqāṣ wa iḥlāf*. He was the author of *al-Muhiṭ fī ḥam‘ bayn al-Muhaḍhdhab wa ḥasīb*, *Sharḥ al-Wajīz*, *al-Tahṣīl* and *‘Aqīda*. See al-Subkī, TS, VIII, 109-113.

¹⁰¹⁵I could only find the biography of his son, ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī ‘Āmir b. Yahyā b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Rabī‘, who died in 666/1268. He was of Ash‘arite theological affiliation and of the Malikite juridical school. He was well-known for his aversity to philosophy and anything heretical. See al-Suyūṭī, BW, 292.

¹⁰¹⁶‘Alī b. Yūsuf b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Bundār was referred to by al-Subkī as the Chief Judge of Egypt Zayn al-Dīn Abu ‘l-Ḥasan b. al-Shayḥ Abi ‘l-Maḥāsin al-Dimashqī, who died in Jumāda II 622/1226 in Egypt. See al-Subkī, TS, VIII, 304.

11. al-Tībī (d. 624/1228) ¹⁰¹⁸	38. Ibn Rashīd al-Sibṭī (d. 721/1322)		
12. Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630/1233) ¹⁰¹⁹	39. Ibn al-Munayyar (d. 803/1401) ¹⁰²⁰		
13. Ibn ‘Abd al-Salām (d. 632/1235) ¹⁰²¹			
14. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1254)			
15. Abū Shāma (d. 665/1268)			
16. al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277)			
17. Ibn Daqīq al-‘Id (d. 702/1302)			
18. al-Adhra‘ī (d. 703/1303)			
19. al-Sharaf al-Dimyātī (d. 705/1306)			
20. Burhān al-Dīn al-Ja‘birī (d. 732/1332) ¹⁰²²			
21. Abū Hayyān (d. 745/1344)			
22. al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348)			

¹⁰¹⁷Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh b. Sa‘d b. Abī Ḥamza, the author of *Muhtāṣar Ṣaḥīḥ al-Buḥārī*, according to al-Qummī, died in 695/1296 in Cairo. See al-Qummī, KĀ, I, 187; GAL, I, 372.

¹⁰¹⁸Abū ‘l-Qāsim ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Ḥamdān al-Tībī was born in 563/1168 and died in Ṣafar 624/1228. See al-Suyūṭī, BW, 71-2; al-Subkī, TS, IV, 65.

¹⁰¹⁹According to al-Suyūṭī, ‘Izz al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. al-Athīr Abī al-Kirām b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Karīm b. ‘Abd al-Wāhid al-Shaybānī al-Jazārī was born on the Island of Ibn ‘Umar in 555/1161. He studied Tradition under the supervision of ‘Abd al-Mun‘im b. Kulayb. He was the author of *Ta’rīħ al-Mawsil*, which he did not complete. He died in Sha‘bān 630/1233. See al-Suyūṭī, TH, 492.

¹⁰²⁰Ibn al-Munayyar was *laqab* of Nāṣr al-Dīn Abu ‘l-‘Abbās Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Maṇṣūr al-Iskandarānī who was referred to by al-Suyūṭī as one of leading scholars qualified to undertake *ijtihād*. He was born in 620/1224 and died in Alexandria in 803/1401. See al-Suyūṭī, HM, I, 316-7.

¹⁰²¹Ibn ‘Abd al-Salām b. al-Muṭahhar b. *Qādī l-Quḍāt* Abī Sa‘d ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī al-Sarī b. Hibat Allāh b. al-Muṭahhar b. ‘Alī b. Abī ‘Aṣrūn, referred to by al-Ṣalāḥ al-Ṣafadī as *faqīh jalil al-qadr wāfir al-dīyāna* studied under his father, died in 632/1235. See al-Ṣafadī, WW, XVIII, 436-7.

¹⁰²²Ibrāhīm b. ‘Umar b. Ibrāhīm Burhān al-Dīn al-Ja‘birī al-Šāfi‘ī, according to al-Kutubī, was born in Ja‘bar. He studied in Bagdad and then in Damascus where he stayed for 40 years and where he composed many works. He died in 732/1332. Ibn Shākir al-Kutubī, FW, I, 39-41.

23. Sharaf al-Dīn al-Munawī (d. 757/1357)			
24. al-Asnāwī (d. 772/1371)			
25. Walī al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī (d. 826/1423) ¹⁰²³			
26. Sharaf al-Dīn b. al-Muqrī (d. 837/1434)			
27. al-Malawī (d. 841/1438) ¹⁰²⁴			

4.3. Evaluation of the sources

Which of the sources listed in the table above had been referred to in three earlier works of al-Suyūtī can be seen in the following table:

QM	1	8	14	15	16	17	18	19	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	40	41	42	44
QM&SM	1	14	15	16	22	40	44												
SM	1	4	5	6	7	14	15	16	22	28	29	42	44						
F	2	3	9	10	11	12	13	20	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	43

From the table above, it is clear that some of the authorities against logic listed in the *Fatwā* had been referred to by al-Suyūtī in his QM and SM. However, there are 19 individuals which were only dealt with by al-Suyūtī in his *Fatwā*.

Although more than half of the opponents of logic mentioned by al-Suyūtī (23 scholars) lived between the 7th-8th/13th – 14th century, logic has also been subjected to opposition in various other centuries: Respectively by 4 scholars in the 9th and 4th; by 5 scholars in the 6th, by 7 seven scholars in the 5th and by one scholar in the 3rd century. The list starts with al-Shāfi‘ī (d. 203/820) and ends with al-Malawī (d. 841/1438). Logic has been opposed in various regions (extending between Mali, Fas, Mecca, Irak, Aleppo and Muslim Malaga (Muslim Spain)). However, the most significant opposition to it took place in Egypt and Syria. Most of those who opposed logic were Shafi‘ites (27), in spite of the fact that the Malikites (14), the Hanbalites (4) and the Hanafite (1) have also opposed it.

It is important to study the contents of this *fatwā* not only because few many studies have been devoted to it before,¹⁰²⁵ but also because of the fact that al-

¹⁰²³Abū Zur‘a Aḥmad b. Abī al-Faḍl ‘Abd al-Rahīm b. al-Husayn, born in Dhu ‘l-Hijja in 762/1362, studied under his father’s supevision. Then he followed courses under the supervision of several scholars: Al-Bulqīnī, al-Burhān al-Abnāsī, Ibn al-Mulqīn, al-Diyā al-Qazwīnī, etc. He was the author of a number of works, among which *Sharḥ Sanad Abī Dāwud*, *Sharḥ al-Bahjā*, *Muḥtaṣar al-Muhiyyāt*, *al-Nukat ‘alā ‘l-Hāwī wa ‘l-Tanbīh wa ‘l-Minhāj*, *Sharḥ Jam‘ al-Jawāmi‘*, etc. He was referred to by al-Suyūtī as *al-imām al-hāfiẓ al-faqih al-uṣūlī*. He was appointed Chief Judge of Egypt deputizing for al-Jalāl al-Bulqīnī. He died in 17 Sha‘ban 826/1423. See al-Suyūtī, TH, 543.

¹⁰²⁴This name probably points to Abū Bakr b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Ayyūb b. Aḥmad al-Malawī, who was born in 762/1361 and died in 841/1438 and to whom al-Suyūtī referred as the *Shaykh Zayn al-Dīn*. Al-Suyūtī, HM, I, 529.

Suyūṭī, when issuing the *fatwā*, referred to two works: *al-Shāmil* by Ibn al-Šabbāg and *al-Risāla* by Ibn Abī Zayd, which he did not list before, as well as to a great number of authorities of various juridical denominations, nineteen of whom, as listed in the table above, had not been dealt with in his QM, JQ and SM.

As far as the relation between the *Fatwā* and QM, JQ and SM is concerned, it should be pointed out that in his *fatwā* al-Suyūṭī states that before deducing a legal opinion on a certain subject matter, a *Muftī* should be knowledgeable of the opinions of the leading scholars on the same issue.¹⁰²⁶

¹⁰²⁵So far only Brunschwig has referred to it, when dealing with the attitude of Ibn Hazm, al-Gazālī and Ibn Taymiyya towards logic. See Brunschwig, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

¹⁰²⁶“...*innamā wazīfatuhū an yanzura fī aqwāl man taqaddamah wa yahtār mā qāma al-dalil ‘indahū ‘alā rajahātih...*” See the *Fatwā*, fol. 423a.

Chapter Five

Conclusion

5. 1. QM, JQ, SM and the *Fatwā* as Sources for the History of the Opposition to Logic and Theology

QM is an indispensable work for the history of the opposition to logic for three obvious reasons: *First*, QM records a number of arguments against logic by more than 40 prominent jurists, most of which have not been dealt with by modern scholars. *Secondly*, al-Suyūtī makes use of works which deal exclusively with the opposition to logic, i.e. *al-Hāfiṭ ‘ala ‘l-Mantiq* and *Nasīḥat al-Muslim al-Mushfiq* *līman Ubtuliya bi Ḥubb ‘Ilm al-Mantiq*, which are (presumably) no longer extant. He even mentions Abū Ḥayyān al-Garnātī’s *al-Nuḍār*, which could help us to understand not only his own biography, but also the history of Muslim Spain. *Thirdly*, in QM al-Suyūtī draws our attention to various arguments against logic, which have not (yet) been referred to by any modern scholars. When discussing the attitude of Ibn Jubayr al-Kinānī toward logic, Rescher, for instance, refers to Tritton’s *Materials* which records only four verses composed by Ibn Jubayr against logic.¹⁰²⁷ Whereas al-Suyūtī records twenty verses in his QM. (See Chap. 1)

However, as a work composed by al-Suyūtī when he was 18 years old, QM still represents his knowledge at a non-advanced level. This is justified with a number of facts: (1) The explicit words against logic by the eponym of the Shafi‘ite school to which al-Suyūtī and most of the sources relied on in QM were affiliated, amazingly escaped al-Suyūtī’s attention; (2) it does not contain a historical discussion of logic. It is true that when composing QM, al-Suyūtī, according to Sartain, had studied *Al-Īsāgūjī* by Porphyry and the commentary on it, but as al-Suyūtī himself admitted, he was still under the supervision of several scholars, among whom are al-Kāfyajī and Ibn al-Humām.¹⁰²⁸ (See Chap. 1).

Although most of the passages in JQ are replete with IT’s concrete scientific criticism of each of the logical principles, there are some passages that can be regarded as direct expressions of IT’s *religious* attitude towards logic, reflecting his censure, condemnation and legal prohibition of the study of logic. (See Chap. 2)

Hallaq is right that when abridging NAI, al-Suyūtī left the logical parts intact and deleted the metaphysical digressions in IT’s discussion. Comparing JQ and NAI, it appears that the repetitive arguments of IT and the digressive discussion on metaphysical issues which al-Suyūtī deleted in JQ, however, contain relevant elements of IT’s religiously-based viewpoints against logic, the logicians, the philosophers, Aristotle, the *Mutakallimūn*, etc. (See Chap. 2)

Although JQ records IT’s references to some prominent Shafi‘ite scholars, such al-Juwaynī and al-Gazālī, they are closely related to the fact that they used (a certain principle of) logic as an instrument of thought, and not to the fact that they issued legal opinions against logic, as claimed by al-Suyūtī in QM, SM and the *Fatwā*. (See Chap. 2)

¹⁰²⁷Rescher, *op. cit.*, p. 60; Tritton, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

¹⁰²⁸Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

The data in SM are much richer than those in QM. This is clearly indicated by the fact that al-Suyūtī provides rich arguments for each part of his topic. The sources he referred to are much more extensive, i.e. the opponents of logic from other professional backgrounds: theologians, historians, and grammarians, while those in QM only include the jurists and traditionists. SM also records the fact that al-Suyūtī was not only content with censuring those occupied with logic to obtain knowledge, but also offers them a solution, advising them to deepen their knowledge of Arabic which is relatively self-sufficient. (See Chap. 3)

When composing SM, al-Suyūtī was influenced by IT's arguments. This is indicated at least by two facts: philological and historical. Philologically speaking, al-Suyūtī incorporates more than one and a half printed pages of IT's arguments recorded in JQ. He repeatedly refers to Ibn Taymiyya, when discussing several issues revolving around the origin of logic and the role of al-Ma'mūn in introducing it into the Muslim world, as well as concerning the first scholar who combined it with the books of *uṣūl*, etc. (See Chap. 3)

The historical influence of Ibn Taymiyya on al-Suyūtī is also confirmed by al-Suyūtī's change of attitude, for instance, towards al-Gazālī to whom he had repeatedly referred in QM as a scholar who changed his opinion in favour of logic. In SM, however, al-Suyūtī stated that al-Gazālī was the first scholar who introduced logic into the sciences of *uṣūl*.¹⁰²⁹ Another explicit historical influence can also be traced in al-Suyūtī's *fatwā* against logic, in which he asserts his view, which has a certain parallelism with that of IT, concerning the superfluousness of logic in obtaining the truth and understanding the oneness of God, maintaining that in each human heart and conscience is imprinted the ability to infer that to each creature belongs a Creator without having to know the principles of logic.¹⁰³⁰ (See Chap. 3)

This development, however, cannot be separated from the context which surrounds the composition of SM, which can be delineated in the following words. Hallaq suggests that the first incident in Islamic legal history where the *Muqallids* openly opposed the claims of a *mujtahid* happened to al-Suyūtī (d. 911/1505).¹⁰³¹ This is closely related to al-Suyūtī's claim for *ijtihād* and *tajdīd* as can be read in several treatises and *fatwās*. As described in his *al-Radd 'alā man Ahlada ila 'l-Ard wa-Jahila anna 'l-Ijtihād fī Kull 'Aṣr Fard*, al-Suyūtī, for instance, argues that *ijtihād* should be fulfilled by the Muslim community because it is a collective duty (*fard kifāya*). If there were no *Mujtahids*, al-Suyūtī maintains, the community would have agreed upon an error.¹⁰³² (See Chap. 3)

Al-Suyūtī's claim for *ijtihād* was contested by the majority of his contemporaries, not because, according to Hallaq, the former had not attained the qualifying conditions to be *mujtahid*, but because of his 'immense self-confidence' and 'boastfullness.' Al-Suyūtī, for instance, asserted that he had attained "the rank of *ijtihād* in *al-ahkām al-shar'iyya*, in prophetic Tradition and in the Arabic language, an achievement unequalled by anyone since the time of

¹⁰²⁹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 45-6.

¹⁰³⁰Fatwā, fol.2b.

¹⁰³¹Hallaq, W.B., *The Gate of Ijtihād: A Study of Islamic Legal History* (University Microfilms International, 1983), p. 76-8; Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 62-3..

¹⁰³²Hallaq, *op. cit.*, p. 76-8; Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 62-3..

Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 756/1355), who was the last scholar in whom these three kinds of *ijtihād* were united.” As evident, according to Sartain, in his treatises and *fatwās*, al-Suyūṭī often condemned his adversaries as fools.¹⁰³³ In *al-Lafz al-Jawharī fī Radd Hubat al-Jawzarī* (the jewelled statement in refutation of al-Jawzarī’s ravings), for instance, al-Suyūṭī, Sartain reports, condemns al-Jawzarī, who had disgraced the former’s position as one of the leading ‘*ulamā’*.¹⁰³⁴ (See Chap. 3)

Despite his thorough knowledge of logic and its opponents as well as partisans among the Muslim scholars, al-Suyūṭī was a jurist whose concern was much more related to legal problems than logical ones. This is reflected in a work later than SM, i.e. the *Fatwā* in which he listed 44 prominent jurists of four legal schools, starting with the eponym of the Shafi‘ite law school, Imām al-Shāfi‘ī (d. 203/820) and ending with the Shafi‘ite al-Malawī (d. 841/1438). By composing this *Fatwā*, al-Suyūṭī, as a *Muftī* whose inherent duty it is to give religious legal advice, seems to argue that his being well-versed in logic and its history as well as its partisans and opponents does not bother him to prohibit people to be occupied with its study as also his predecessors had done. (See Chap. 4)

Although in his *Fatwā* al-Suyūṭī merely lists the individuals whom he claimed to have opposed logic and does not provide us with their prosopographical information, his merit should be acknowledged here, because he has added significant new data indispensable for further prosopographical study, through which one will be able to gain further knowledge of the history of the opposition to logic. Besides, the list of scholars against logic incorporated in this *Fatwā* can be made use of as a guideline to understand the movement against logic by consulting biographical dictionaries, so that one may possibly come to know the intellectual biography of these scholars, as well as their works. (See Chap. 4)

In sum, although QM, JQ, SM and the *Fatwā* mainly convey the shared normative message of their author as a legal prominent scholar, i.e., that logic is prohibited whatsoever, these works at the same time guide us to rich prosopographical data which shed light on the history of logic and theology in the Islamic world as well as of the opposition to both.

5. 2. Prosopographical Data against Logic in the Works of al-Suyūṭī

It could be said that al-Suyūṭī made use of, borrowing Humphrey’s and Van Ess’s term, a prosopographical approach attempting to establish as many facts as possible concerning all those who seem to have been connected to a particular subject, and then to convert these facts into a collective portrait of this subject.¹⁰³⁵ The aim of using a prosopographical approach is closely connected to what Van Ess calls as an attempt to provide ‘ein statistisches Bild.’¹⁰³⁶ All al-Suyūṭī attempted in his four works was to present to his readers the fact that logic as well as theology had been subjected to opposition by many leading scholars whose arguments he dealt with in his texts. Here follows a chronologically arranged survey of the scholars concerned.

¹⁰³³Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 61-3.

¹⁰³⁴Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

¹⁰³⁵Humphreys, R.S., *Islamic History*, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

¹⁰³⁶Van Ess, TG, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. ix.

No.	Name	Year of Death	Legal Aff.	Residence	Work(s) Cited
1.	Abū Ḥanīfah	150/768	The Eponym	Baġhdād	-
2.	Al-Šāfi‘ī	203/820	The Eponym	Egypt	-
3.	Abū Sa‘īd al-Sīrāfī	368/979	Hanafite	Baġhdād	The debate
4.	Abū Tālib al-Makkī	383/994	Malikite	Mecca	Qūṭ al-Qulūb
5.	Ibn Abī Zayd	ca.386/997	Malikite		Al-Risāla
6.	Abū ’l-Ḥasan b. al-Hassār	392/1003	Malikite		-
7.	Abū ’l-Ḥasan b. al-Habīb al-Nīsabūrī	406/1016	Malikite	Nīshāpur	-
8.	Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr	463/1071	Malikite	Cordoba	Iḥṭāf al-Nubalā’
9.	Abū Naṣr b. al-Qushayrī	469/1077	Shafi‘ite	Nīshāpur	-
10.	Abū ’l-Walīd al-Bājī	474/1081	Malikite	Almeira	-
11.	Ibn al-Ṣabbāg	477/1085	Shafi‘ite	Nīshāpur	Al-Shāmil
12.	Al-Juwaynī	478/1085	Shafi‘ite	Nīshāpur	-
13.	Naṣr al-Maqdisī	490/1098	Shafi‘ite	Damascus	Al-Hujja
14.	al-Gazālī	505/1111	Shafi‘ite	Ṭūs	iḥyā’ & al-Tafriqa
15.	Abū Bakr al-Turtūshī	520/1127	Malikite	Damascus	-
16.	Abū Bakr b. al-‘Arabī	543/1148	Malikite	Seville	-
17.	Al-‘Attār (‘Aqbada)	569/1174	Shafi‘ite	Hamadhān	-
18.	Ibn ‘Asākir	571/1176	Shafi‘ite	Damascus	Ta’rīḥ
19.	al-Silafī	576/1180	Shafi‘ite	Alexandria	Mu‘jam al-Safar
20.	Ibn al-Jawzī	597/1201	Hanbalite	Baġhdād	Talbīs Iblīs
21.	‘Imād al-Dīn b. Yūnus	608/1212	Shafi‘ite		-
22.	Ibn Jubayr al-Kīnānī	614/1217	Malikite	Valencia	Al-Rīḥla
23.	Ibn Būndār	622/1226	Shafi‘ite	Damascus	-
24.	Al-Rāfi‘ī	623/1226-7	Shafi‘ite	Qazwīnī	Al-Sharḥ al-Sagīr
25.	al-Tībī	624/1228	Shafi‘ite		-
26.	Ibn al-Aṭhīr	630/1233	Shafi‘ite	Mosul	-
27.	Ibn ‘Abd al-Salām	632/1235	Shafi‘ite		-
28.	Abū ḥabīb al-Mālaqī	640/1243	Malikite	Alandalus	-
29.	Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ	643/1254	Shafi‘ite	Damascus	Fatāwā
30.	Abū Shāma	665/1268	Shafi‘ite	Damascus	al-Tawakkul
31.	Abū ‘Āmir b. Rabī‘	666/1268	Malikite		-
32.	al-Nawawī	676/1277	Shafi‘ite	Damascus	Tabaqāt,

					Sharḥ al-Muhadhdhab, al-Rawḍa
33.	‘Abd al-Sātir	679/1281	Hanbalite	Damascus	-
34.	Ibn Abī Hamza	695/1296	Malikite	Cairo	-
35.	Ibn Daqīq al-‘Id	702/1302	Shafi‘ite	Cairo	-
36.	al-Adhra‘ī	703/1303	Shafi‘ite	Aleppo	-
37.	Al-Sharaf al-Dimyātī	705/1306	Shafi‘ite	Egypt	-
38.	Sa‘d al-Dīn al-Hārithī	710/1311	Hanbalite	Egypt	-
39.	Al-Sharaf al-Baydāwī	716/1317	Shafi‘ite	Egypt	Hāshiya
40.	Ibn Rashid al-Sibṭī	721/1322	Malikite	Fez	-
41.	Ibn Taymiyya	729/1329	Hanbalite	Damascus	al-Radd
42.	Kamāl al-Dīn al-Marāgī	ca. 730/1330	Shafi‘ite	Damascus	-
43.	Burhān al-Dīn al-Ja‘barī	732/1332	Shafi‘ite		-
44.	Zayn al-Dīn al-Subkī	735/1335	Shafi‘ite	Damascus	-
45.	Zayn al-Dīn b. al-Murāhhil	d. 738/1338	Shafi‘ite	Damascus	-
46.	Ibn Kathīr	744/1344	Shafi‘ite	Damascus	Ta’rīḥ
47.	Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī	744/1344	Shafi‘ite	Damascus	-
48.	Abū Ḥayyān al-Garnātī	745/1344	Shafi‘ite	Granada	Al-Nuḍār
49.	Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ṣafadī	746/1345	Shafi‘ite	Damascus	Sharḥ Lāmiyat al-‘Ajam
50.	Al-Adfuwī	747/1347	Shafi‘ite	Cairo	Kitāb Farā’id
51.	al-Dhahabī	748/1348	Shafi‘ite	Damascus	Siyar, Mu‘jam and Ta’rīḥ
52.	Sirāj al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī	750/1349	Hanafite	Iraq	Al-Ḥaṭṭ, Naṣīhat al-Muslim
53.	Sharaf al-Dīn al-Munāwī	757/1357	Shafi‘ite	Egypt	-
54.	‘Izz al-Dīn b. Jamā‘a	767/1366	Shafi‘ite	Egypt	-
55.	Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī	771/1370	Shafi‘ite	Damascus	-
56.	al-Asnāwī	772/1371	Shafi‘ite	Egypt	Tabaqāt
57.	Badr al-Dīn al-Zarkashī	794/1392	Shafi‘ite	Egypt	-
58.	Ibn al-Munayyar	803/1401	Shafi‘ite	Alexandria	-
59.	Wālī al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī	826/1423	Shafi‘ite	Iraq	-
60.	Sharaf al-Dīn b. al-Muqrī	837/1434	Shafi‘ite	Jemen	-
61.	al-Malawī	841/1438	-	Egypt	-
62.	‘Alam al-Dīn al-Bulqīnī	868/1461	Shafi‘ite	Egypt	-

63.	Taqī al-Dīn al-Shumunni	872/1468	Malikite	Egypt	-
64.	Kamāl al-Dīn al-Kāmilī	874/1470	Shafi'ite	Egypt	-
65.	'Alā' al-Dīn al-Makkī	ca.880/1476	Shafi'ite	Egypt	-
66.	Ibn al-Ṣadr al-Balbīsī	904/1499	Shafi'ite	Egypt	Al-Tanbīhāt
67.	Ibn 'Isām al-Asadī	-			
68.	Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Tuwaynī	-			

The following facts can be inferred from the table above: *First*, although more than half (37 scholars) of the opponents of logic and/or theology lived between the 7th-8th/13th – 14th centuries, these disciplines have also been subjected to opposition in various other centuries: Respectively by eight scholars in the 9th and 5th; by 7 scholars in the 6th, by 3 scholars in the 4th, by 2 scholars in the 3rd, and by one scholar in the 10th century. The list starts with Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/768), followed by al-Shāfi'i (d. 203/820) and ends with al-Suyūtī's contemporary, al-Balbīsī (d. 904/1499). *Secondly*, logic has been opposed in various regions (extending between Fas, Mecca, Irak, Aleppo and Valencia). However, the most significant opposition took place in Egypt and Syria. *Thirdly*, most of those who opposed logic were Shafi'ite (43), in spite of the fact that the Malikites (14), the Hanbalites (4) and the Hanafite (1) were also opposed to it. *Forthly*, most of the written sources which al-Suyūtī relies on for discussion of the opposition to logic are *fīqh* books, their commentaries as well as super-commentaries (11, 24, 29, 30, 32, 39, 51 and 66) and biographical dictionaries (works on history) (8, 18, 19, 22, 48, 49, 51 and 56). However, he also relied on works dealing specifically with the refutation of logic (41 and 52), and on those to which modern scholars refer as dealing with theologico-juridical and/or mystical issues (4, 14 and 20). Al-Suyūtī even mentions two works (which are presumably no longer extant, no. 52) that deal exclusively with the opposition to logic.

Fifthly, there are some scholars (no: 30, 32, 41, 47, 56) whom al-Suyūtī qualified as *mujtahids*,¹⁰³⁷ three (no. 14, 19 and 35) as *mujaddids* (renewer of the religion),¹⁰³⁸ four scholars whom he referred to as Chief Judge (*qāḍī al-quḍāt*) (54, 53, 62, 63);¹⁰³⁹ one as *aqdā al-quḍāt* (no. 44);¹⁰⁴⁰ one (no. 61) as a mystic, while the rest are referred to by al-Suyūtī and/or by the biographers as belonging to the most knowledgeable persons of their time in *Tafsīr*, Tradition and Jurisprudence (no. 29),¹⁰⁴¹ the “seal of the *Hāfiẓs*” (no. 51),¹⁰⁴² the greatest traditionist in Al-Andalus (no. 16),¹⁰⁴³ the great *Hāfiẓ* and the traditionist of Iraq (no. 52),¹⁰⁴⁴ a leading scholar of Yemen (no. 60),¹⁰⁴⁵ etc. Three members of the Subki family (no.

¹⁰³⁷Sartain, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

¹⁰³⁸Al-Suyūtī, *al-Taḥadduth*, *op. cit.*, p. 218, 222.

¹⁰³⁹Al-Suyūtī, BW, p. 25-7; Al-Suyūtī, TH, 531; QM, 12,

¹⁰⁴⁰Al-Subkī, TS, X, 89.

¹⁰⁴¹Al-Suyūtī, TH, 500.

¹⁰⁴²Al-Suyūtī, TH, 517.

¹⁰⁴³GAL, I, 368; Al-Suyūtī, TM, 808-9.

¹⁰⁴⁴Al-Suyūtī, TH, 526.

¹⁰⁴⁵Al-Suyūtī, BW, p. 193-4.

44, 47, 55) who were considered by Laoust to belong to the most eminent representatives of Shafi'iism and Syro-Egyptian Ash'arism,¹⁰⁴⁶ are referred to by al-Suyūtī in his discussion against logic in QM at one and the same time.

Sixthly, al-Suyūtī has also drawn our attention to a number of Andalusian sources against logic (no. 8, 22, 48), one of which is *al-Nuḍār*, indispensable not only for the biography of its author, al-Garnātī, and his opposition against logic, but also to gain an understanding of the history of Muslim Spain. This work, according to al-Suyūtī, discusses al-Garnātī's early beginnings, his activities, and his teachers as well as his flight from Granada.

From the table above, it is crystal-clear that in his discussion al-Suyūtī has limited himself to Sunnite scholars, most of whom were of the Shafi'iite school of law, in spite of the fact that some scholars of non-Sunnite theological affiliation had opposed logic as fervently as the Sunnite scholars. This is substantiated by the fact that not a single reference was made by al-Suyūtī in his discussion against logic, for instance, to the Zaidite Ibn al-Wazīr al-Šan‘ānī (840/1374) who had composed *Tarjih Asālib al-Qur‘ān ‘alā Asālib al-Yūnān*, in which he fervently condemned Greek logic and philosophy. Accordingly, the systematic opposition against logic by the Mu'tazilite Ibn al-Shirshīr (d. 293/905) and the Shi'ite thinkers, Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbahtī (d. ca. 310/922), the author of *al-Radd ‘ala ’l-Mantiq* and Abū al-Najā al-Farīd, the author of *Kasr al-Mantiq*, received no attention from Al-Suyūtī either.

5. 3. Al-Suyūtī's Changing Views on al-Shāfi‘ī, al-Gazālī and al-Juwainī in QM, JQ, SM and the *Fatwā*

QM, JQ, SM and the *Fatwā* record interesting patterns in al-Suyūtī's reference to certain authorities: (1) al-Shāfi‘ī, (2) al-Gazālī, and (3) al-Juwainī.

1. Al-Shāfi‘ī

In a work explicitly composed to prohibit the study of logic, i.e. QM, al-Shāfi‘ī is not referred to as having prohibited the study of logic, but amazingly as the one to prohibit *kalām*: “Any affliction by God, except *al-shirk*, is better for man than being afflicted by Him through *kalām*;” (2) “running away from *kalām* is like running away from a lion;” and (3) “my opinion on the people of *kalām* is that they should be beaten with the lash, and be paraded along the markets while summoning the people that this is the consequence of neglecting the science of *shari‘a*, for being occupied with *’ilm al-kalām*.¹⁰⁴⁷ In SM, al-Shāfi‘ī is quoted by al-Suyūtī as having said that the ignorance of the people and their controversies are only caused by their abandoning the language of the Arabs and their inclination to the language of Aristotle.¹⁰⁴⁸ While in the *Fatwā*, al-Suyūtī only lists al-Shāfi‘ī as one of those who prohibited logic.

With regard to the written sources relied on by al-Suyūtī in representing al-Shāfi‘ī's arguments against logic and/or theology, the following can be said: In QM, al-Suyūtī refers to *Sharḥ al-Muhadhdhab* by al-Nawawī, in SM, he refers to

¹⁰⁴⁶Laoust, H., “Ibn Taymiyya,” EI², III, 954.

¹⁰⁴⁷QM, p. 3, l. 19-23.

¹⁰⁴⁸SM, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

al-Tadhkira by Ibn Jamā'a, while in the *Fatwā*, he does not refer to any written sources.

2. Al-Gazālī

In a work composed when al-Suyūtī was 18 years old, i.e. QM, he repeatedly asserts that al-Gazālī withdrew from his opinion in favour of logic.¹⁰⁴⁹ Through his abridgement of Ibn Taymiyya's NAI, i.e. JQ, al-Suyūtī was led to believe that al-Gazālī made use of definitions to obtain knowledge following the logicians, and also was guided in the idea that al-Gazālī had composed *Kitāb al-Mī'yār* for such a purpose.¹⁰⁵⁰ In SM, he likewise refers to al-Gazālī as the first to combine the books of *uṣūl* with logic.¹⁰⁵¹ However, in the *Fatwā*, he turns to the opinion that al-Gazālī had prohibited logic in the end of his life.

For the view that al-Gazālī had changed his favourable attitude towards logic, al-Suyūtī refers to *Naṣīḥat al-Mušfiq liman Ubtuliya bi Hubb Ilm al-Manṭiq* by Sirāj al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī. While for his opinion that al-Gazālī was the first to combine the books of *uṣūl* with logic, al-Suyūtī refers to NAI (*al-Radd*) by Ibn Taymiyya. In the *Fatwā*, however, he does not refer to any written sources at all.

Attention may be drawn to the way in which al-Suyūtī represents IT's reference to al-Gazālī. Here, al-Suyūtī can be said to have purposely limited IT's frequent references to al-Gazālī. This is clearly reflected by the fact that NAI, as discussed in chapter three, records more than 28 references by IT to al-Gazālī *as one who upheld the principle of the logicians*, whereas its abridged version, viz. JQ, records only six references to him. This remarkable phenomenon may be closely related to al-Suyūtī's earlier assertion, as recorded in his QM, that al-Gazālī had changed his favourable view on logic and had become one of its fervent opponents.

3. Al-Juwainī

JQ, SM and the *Fatwā* record al-Suyūtī's reference to al-Juwainī in the following unique manner. Although JQ is an abridged version of IT's *Naṣīḥa*, it can inform us of the fact that al-Suyūtī was led to believe that al-Juwainī was a member of the Ash'arite theological schools, acknowledging the benefit of definition (*al-hadd*) to distinguish an object (*al-mahdūd*), i.e., one who makes use of logic as a means to be led to certainty.¹⁰⁵² However, a work composed soon after JQ, i.e., SM, tells us the opposite, which we leads us to believe that al-Suyūtī convincingly argued that al-Juwainī repented from his occupation with *kalām*.¹⁰⁵³ Interestingly, the fact that al-Juwainī abandoned logic is not recorded by al-Suyūtī in his SM, but in a work composed later, i.e. in the *Fatwā* in which he explicitly included al-Juwainī in his list of scholars who prohibited logic.¹⁰⁵⁴

For the fact that al-Juwainī was an Ash'arite who made use of logic as means of obtaining knowledge, al-Suyūtī was guided by his abridgement of IT's

¹⁰⁴⁹QM, p. 1, l. 22-23.

¹⁰⁵⁰JQ, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

¹⁰⁵¹SM, *op. cit.*, p. 45-6.

¹⁰⁵²JQ, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

¹⁰⁵³SM, *op. cit.*, p. 236-7.

¹⁰⁵⁴Fatwā, fol. 1b.

NAI. While the fact that the former had abandoned *kalām*, relied on Ibn al-Sam‘ānī’s *Ta’rīh*, al-Asnawi’s *Tabaqāt* and Ibn al-Jawzī’s *Talbīs al-Iblīs*. Conversely, for the fact that al-Juwaynī had prohibited logic, al-Suyūṭī does not give a single reference.

Bibliography

Works in Arabic:

- Abū Zahra, Muḥammad, *Ibn Taymiyya: Ḥayātuh wa ‘Aṣruh; Arā’uh wa Fiqhuh* (Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-‘Arabī, 1953)
- Al-Ājurī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn, *al-Sharī‘a* (Cairo: Maṭba‘at al-Sunna al-Muḥammadiyya, 1369/1950), ed. Muḥammad Hāmid al-Fāqī
- , *Kitāb al-Sharī‘a* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1995), ed. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan Ismā‘il
- Amin, A., *Duḥa ʻl-Islām* (Cairo: Lajnat al-Ta’lif wa ’l-Tarjama wa ’l-Nashr, 1934-6), 3 vols
- Al-Ash‘arī, al-Imām Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Ismā‘il, *Kitāb Maqālat al-Islāmiyyīn wa Iḥtilāf al-Muṣallīn* (Istanbul: Maṭba‘at al-Dawla, 1929) ed. H. Ritter, 2 vols
- Al-Asqalānī, Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Durar al-Kāmiṇa fī A‘yān al-Mi‘a al-Thāmiṇa* (Cairo: Maṭba‘a al-Maydanī, 1966), ed. Muḥammad Sayyid Jād al-Ḥaqqa, 5 vols
- Al-Bagdādī, Abū Bakr al-Ḥaṭīb, *Sharaf Aṣḥāb al-Hadīth* (Ankara: Ankara Üniveritesi Basimevi, 1971), ed. Muḥammad Sa‘id Ḥaṭīboğlu
- Al-Buhārī, *Kitāb Ḥalq Af‘al al-Ībād* (Cairo: Maktaba al-Turāth al-Islāmī, 1408/1987), ed. Abū Muḥammad Sālim b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Hādī al-Salafī and Abū Hāfir Muḥammad al-Sa‘id b. Basiyūnī al-Ibyānī
- Al-Dāwūdī al-Mālikī, *Tarjamat al-Suyūṭī*, Wetzstein I 20 (abbr. WE, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin), fol 70b-72a.
- Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-I‘tidāl* (Cairo: Dār Ihya’i ’l-Kutub al-‘Arabiyya, 1963), ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī, 4 vols
- , *Siyar A‘yān al-Nubalā’* (Beirut: Mu’assasa al-Risāla, 1986-1992), 25 vols., ed. Shu‘ayb al-Arnā’ūt
- , *Ta‘rīħ al-Islām wa Ṭabaqāt al-Mashāhīr wa ’l-A‘yān* (Cairo: Maktaba al-Qudsī, 1947), ed. Husam al-Dīn al-Qudsī, 18 vols.
- , *Ta‘rīħ al-Islām, Hawādīth wa Wafayāt* (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1994-7), ed. Dr. ‘Umar ‘Abd al-Salām Tadmuri, 51 vols
- Fodah, Sa‘id, *Tad‘im al-Manṭiq: Jawla Naqdīyya ma‘a ’l-Mu‘āridīn li ‘Ilm al-Manṭiq mina ’l-Mutaqqaddimīn* (‘Ammān: Dār al-Rāzī, 2002)
- Al-Gazālī, Abū Ḥāmid, *al-Muṣṭafā min ‘Ilm al-Uṣūl* (Cairo: Al-Maṭba‘a al-Amīriyya, 1322/1904), 2 vols
- , *Ihya’ ‘Ulūm al-Dīn* (Cairo: al-Maṭba‘a al-Azhariyya al-Miṣriyya, 1302/1885), 2 vols
- , *Faysal al-Tafrīqa bayna ʻl-Islām wa ’l-Zandaqa* (Cairo: Dār Ihya’ al-Kutub al-‘Arabiyya, 1381/1961), ed. Dr. Sulaymān Dunyā
- Al-Gazzī, *al-Kawākib al-Sā‘ira bi A‘yān al-Mi‘a al-Āshira*, ed. Jibrā’il S. Jabbūr, (Beirut: American Press, 1945), 3 vols
- Al-Hamawī, Yāqūt b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Rūmī, *Jacut’s geographisches Wörterbuch*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld (Leipzig : 1866-73), 6 vols.
- Al-Harawī, ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Anṣārī, *Dhamm al-Kalām wa Ahlīh* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr al-Lubnānī, 1994), ed. Samīḥ Dugaym
- Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Jāmi‘ Bayān al-‘Ilm wa Fadlīh* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 2000), ed. Mus‘id ‘Abd al-Hamīd Muḥammad al-Sa‘danī
- Ibn Abī al-Hadid, *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāga* (Cairo: Dār Ihya’ al-Kutub al-‘Arabiyya,

- 1959), 20 vols
- Ibn Hishām, *Sīrat Sayyidinā Muḥammad Rasūl Allāh ṣalla allāh ‘alayh wa sallam riwayāt Abī Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Hishām* (Göttingen: Dieterischen Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1860), ed. F. Wüstenfeld, 2 vols
- Ibn Ḥaldūn, *al-Muqaddimah* (Cairo: Dār al-Fikr, 1930)
- Ibn Manzūr, *Lisān al-‘Arab*, ed. ‘Abd Allāh ‘Alī al-Kabīr (Cairo: Dār al-Ma‘ārif, 1984), 6 vols
- Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Miftāḥ Dār al-Sa‘āda* (Cairo: Maṭba‘a al-Ittiḥādī al-Miṣrī)
- Ibn Rajab, *Kitāb al-Dhayl ‘alā Ṭabaqāt al-Hanābila* (Cairo: Maktaba al-Sunna al-Muhammadiyya, 1953), ed. Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Faqī, 2 vols
- Ibn Taymiyya, *Kitāb al-Radd ‘ala l-Manṭiqiyyīn* (Bombay: al-Maṭba‘a al-Qayyima, 1949), ed. Sharaf al-Dīn al-Kutubī and (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr al-Lubnānī, 1993), ed. Dr. Rafiq al-‘Ajm, 2 vols.
- , *al-Manṭiq wa l-Halal fīh* (Mss 3845 (187-189), Maktabat al-Asad, Damascus, Syria)
- , *Majmū‘at al-Rasā’il al-Kubrā* (Cairo: al-Maṭba‘a al-Āmira al-Sharafiyya, 1323/1906), 2 vols
- Al-Jābirī, ‘Alī Ḥusayn, *al-Fikr al-Salafī ‘ind al-Shī‘a al-Ithnā ‘ashariyya. Dirāsa Tahliyya li Mawqif al-Fikr al-Salafī fī l-Islām ‘Umūman wa ‘Ind al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyya ‘alā Wajh al-Ḥuṣūṣ min Manṭiq wa Falsafat al-Yūnān* (Beirut: Manshūrāt ‘Uwaydāt, 1977)
- Al-Kinānī, Abū al-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Jubayr, *Rihla* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1907)
- Al-Kutubī, Muḥammad b. Shākir, *Fawāt al-Wafāyāt* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1973), ed. Dr. Ihsān ‘Abbās, 4 vols
- Al-Lālakā’ī, Abu ‘l-Qāsim Hibat Allāh b. al-Hasan b. al-Manṣūr al-Ṭabarī, *Sharḥ Usūl I’tiqād Ahl al-Sunna wa l-Jamā‘a* (Riyāḍ: Dār Ṭāyyiba, 1985), ed. Dr. Aḥmad Sa‘ad Hamdān, 2 vols.
- Al-Makkī, Abū Ṭālib, *Qūt al-Qulūb* (Cairo: al-Maṭba‘a al-Miṣriyya, 1932)
- Ma‘rūf, Bashshār ‘Awwād, *al-Ḏahabī wa Minḥājuhū fī Kitābihī Ta’rīħ al- Islām* (Cairo: Matba‘at ‘Īsā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī wa Shirkāhu, 1976)
- Al-Muḥāsibī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥārith b. Asad, *Al-Ri‘āya li Huqūqi llāh* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1995), ed. ‘Abd al-Qādir Aḥmad ‘Aṭā
- , *Kitāb al-Ri‘āya li Huqūq Allāh* (London: Luzac & Co., 1940), ed. Margareth Smith
- Mukarram, ‘Abd al-‘Alī Sālim, et. al, *Mu‘jam al-Qirā‘a al-Qur’āniyya* (Kuwait: Maṭbū‘at Jāmi‘at al-Kuwayt, 1406/1986)
- Al-Nashshār, ‘Alī Sāmī, *Manāhij al-Baḥth ‘inda Mufakkirī al-Islām* (Cairo: Dar al-Ma‘arif, 1978)
- , *Nash’at al-Fikr al-Falsafī fī l-Islām* (Cairo: Dār al-Ma‘ārif, 1981), 2 vols
- Al-Niffarī, Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Jabbār b. al-Ḥasan, *Kitāb al-Mawāqif* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935), ed. by A.J. Arberry
- Al-Qummī, al-Shayh ‘Abbās, *al-Kunā wa l-Alqāb* (Najf: al-Ḥudayriyya, 1956/1376), 2 vols.
- Al-Qādī Iyād, *Tartīb al-Madārik wa Taqrīb al-Masālik li Ma‘rifat A‘lām Madhhab Mālik*, ed. Dr. Aḥmad Bakīr Maḥmūd (Beirut: Dār Maktabat al-Hayāt, 1967), 2 vols
- Al-Ṣafadī, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, *al-Wafī bi l-Wafāyāt*, ed. by H. Ritter, Ihsān ‘Abbās, Sven

- Dederling, Ayman Fu'ad Saiyid, *et. al.* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1969ff)
(Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1970ff), (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner
Verlag, 1988ff), 22 vols
- , *al-Gayth al-Musajjam fī Sharḥ Lāmiyat al-‘Ājam* (Cairo: al-Maṭba‘a al-
Azharīyya al-Miṣriyya, 1305/1888)
- Al-Shahrazūrī, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, *Fatāwā ibn al-Ṣalāḥ fī ‘l-Tafsīr wa ‘l-Hadīth wa ‘l-
‘Aqā’id* (Cairo: Idāra al-Ṭibā‘a al-Munīriyya, 1348)
- Al-Sahawī, *al-Daw’ al-Lāmi‘ li Ahl al-Qarn al-Tāsi‘*, (Cairo: Maktaba al-Qudsī,
1353/1935), 6 vols
- Al-Sam‘ānī, Abū Sa‘īd ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Muḥammad b. Manṣūr al-Tamīmī, *al-
Ansāb*, ed. ‘Abd Allāh ‘Umar al-Bārūdī (Beirut: Dār al-Lujnān, 1408/1988),
5 vols
- Al-Šan‘ānī, Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Wazīr al-Hasanī al-Yamanī, *Tarjīh Asālib al-
Qur’ān ‘alā Asālib al-Yūnān* (Cairo: Maṭba‘a al-Ma‘āhid, 1349/1931)
- Al-Shādhilī, ‘Abd al-Qādir, *Bahjat al-Ābidīn bi Tarjamat Jalāl al-Dīn*, MSS.
(Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, 4436), 10, 4574 (2).
- Al-Shak‘a, Muṣṭafā, *Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūtī Masīratuh al-‘Ilmiyya wa Mabāḥithuh
al-Lugawīyya* (Cairo: al-Dār al-Miṣriyya al-Lubnāniyya, 1994)
- Al-Silafī, Ḥāfiẓ Abū Tāhir, *Mu‘jam al-Safar* (Islamabad: Islamic Research
Institute, 1988), ed. Dr. S.M. Zaman
- Al-Subkī, Tāj al-Dīn, *Tabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyya al-Kubrā* (Cairo: Isā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī,
1964-76), ed. ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Ḥuluw & Maḥmūd
Muhammad al-Ṭanāḥī, 10 vols
- Al-Subkī, Taqī al-Dīn, *Fatāwā al-Subkī* (Beirut: Dār al-Ma‘rifa, 1980), 2 vols.
- Al-Suyūtī, Jalāl al-Dīn, *Jahd al-Qariha fī Tajrīd al-Naṣīha* (Cairo: Matba‘a al-
Sa‘āda, 1947), ed. ‘Alī Sāmī al-Nashshār
- , *Sawn al-Manṭiq wa ‘l-Kalām ‘an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa ‘l-Kalām*, ed. ‘Alī Sāmī
al-Nashshār (Cairo: Matba‘a al-Sa‘āda, 1947) and 2nd ed. ‘Alī Sāmī al-
Nashshār and Su‘āda ‘Abd al-Rāziq (Cairo: Dār al-Naṣr li ‘l-Ṭibā‘a, 1970)
- , *Al-Qawl al-Mushriq fī Tahrim Ishtigāl bi ‘l-Manṭiq*, a manuscript copy
belonging to Prof. Dr. P.S. van Koningsveld. This manuscript was copied
for him by the late Muṣṭafā Nāji, from a private library in Rabat,
Morocco.
- , *Fatwā against Logic entitled: al-Qawl al-Mushriq fī Tahrim Ishtigāl bi ‘l-
Manṭiq*, Majāmi‘ Qawwāla 25, Dār al-Kutub (Egypt).
- , *Kitāb al-Taḥadduth bi Ni‘mati ‘llāh* (Cairo: al-Maṭba‘a al-‘Arabiyya al-
Hadītha), ed. E.M. Sartain
- , *Bugyat al-Wu‘āt fī Tabaqāt al-Lugawīyyin wa ‘l-Nuḥāt*, (Cairo: Matba‘a al-
Sa‘āda, 1908)
- , *Tabaqāt al-Huffāz* (Cairo: Maktaba Wahba, 1973), ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad
‘Umar, 2 vols.
- , *Tabaqāt al-Mufassirīn* (Leyden: S. & J. Luchtmans, 1839), ed. Albertus
Meursinge
- , *Husn al-Muḥādara fī Aḥbār Miṣr wa ‘l-Qāhira* (Cairo: Matba‘a al-Mawsū‘āt,
1903), 2 vols.
- , *Nazm al-Iqyān*, (New York: al-Maṭba‘a al-Sūriyya al-Amīriqiyya, 1927), ed.
Dr. Philip Hitti
- , *al-Hāwī li ‘l-Fatawā* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1993), 2 vols

- al-Tabāṭabā’ī, Muṣṭafā, *al-Mufakkirūn al-Muṣlimūn fī Muwājahat al-Manṭiq al-Yūnānī Naqd ‘ulamā’ al-Muṣlimīn li Manṭiq Aristū wa Muwāzanatih bi Manṭiq al-Falāsifa al-Garbiyyīn*, (Beyrut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 11410/1990)
- Al-Tawḥīdī, Abū Ḥayyān, *al-Imtā‘ wa l-Mu‘ānasa* (Cairo: Lajnat al-Ta’lif, 1953), ed. Aḥmad Amīn and Aḥmad al-Zayn, 3 vols.
- Al-Tinbuktī, Aḥmad Bābā, *Nayl al-Ibtihāj bi-Taṭrīz al-Dibāj*, that is printed on the margins of Ibn Farḥūn, *al-Dibāj al-Mudhahhab fī Ma‘rifat A‘yān al-Madhhāb* (Cairo: Matba‘a al-Sā‘āda, 1329/1911)
- Yāsīn, Ja‘far ‘Alī, *Faylasūf ‘Ālim: Dirāsa Taḥlīlīyya li ḥayāt ibn Sīnā wa Fikrī al-Falsafī* (Beirut: Dār al-Andalus, 1984/1404)
- Al-Zayn, Muḥammad Ḥusnī, *Manṭiq Ibn Taymiyya wa Manhajuh al-Fikrī* (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1979)

Works in European Languages:

- Abrahamov, Binyamin, *Islamic Theology: Traditionalism and Rationalism* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998)
- Ali, Mufti, “Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūtī against Logic and Kalām Analysis and Significance of Ṣawn al-Manṭiq wa ‘l-Kalām ‘an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa ‘l-Kalām,” in *Hamdard Islamicus* (2005), vol. XXVIII, no. 2, p. 23-44
- , “A Statistical Portrait of the Resistance to Logic by Sunni Muslim Scholars Based on the Works of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūtī (849-909/1448-1505),” in ILS 15 (2008), p. 250-267
- Allard, Michel, *Le problème des attributs divins dans la doctrine d’al-As‘arī et de ses premiers grands disciples* (Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique, 1965)
- Anawati, G.C., “Arabic Alchemy,” in *the Encyclopaedia of the History of Arabic Science*, (London & New York: Routledge, 1996), ed. Roshdi Rashed, vol. III, p. 853-885
- Arioli, A, “al-Rāfi‘ī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), ed. C.E. Bosworth, *et al*, vol. VIII, p. 389
- Arnaldez, R. “al-Muḥāsibī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&New York: E.J. Brill, 1993), ed. C.E. Bosworth, *et al*, vol. VII, p. 466-7
- , “Al-Kurtubī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. V, p. 512-3.
- Al-Ba‘albākī, Rūhī, *al-Mawrid, Arabic English Dictionary* (Beirut: Dār al-‘Ilm li ‘l-Malāyīnī, 1988)
- Baqir, Zainal Abidin, *The Problem of Definition in Islamic Logic: A Study of Abū al-Najā al-Farīd’s Kasr al-Manṭiq in Comparison with Ibn Taimiyyah’s Kitāb al-Radd alā al-Manṭiqiyyīn* (Kuala Lumpur: ISTAC, 1998)
- Bearman, P.J., “Adī b. Arṭāt,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004), ed. P.J. Bearman *et al*, vol. XII, p. 41.
- Beaurecueil, S.D., *Khwādja ‘Abdullāh Anṣārī (396-481/1006-1089) Mystique Hanbalite* (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique)
- , “al-Anṣārī al-Harawī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al*, vol. I., p. 515-6
- Becker, C.H., ‘Christliche Polemik und islamische Dogmenbildung’,

- Islamstudien*, Leipzig, 1924, i.432-449
- Bell, R., *The Qur'an, translated with a critical re-arrangement of the Surahs* (Edinburgh: T&T. Clark, 1937), 2 vols
- , *the Origin of Islam in its Christian Environment*, 1926
- Ben Cheneb, M. and J. De Somogyi, “al-Dhahabī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&Paris: E.J. Brill & G.-P. Maisonneuve & Larose S.A., 1965), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. II, p. 214-216
- Bosworth, C.E., “al-Tabarī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000), ed. P.J. Bearman *et al*, vol. X, p. 11.
- Bouyges, M., *Essai de Chronologie des oeuvres de al-Gazali (Algazel)* (Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique, 1959)
- Böwering, G., “Sahl al-Tustarī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. VIII, p. 840-1.
- Brentjes, Sonja, “Orthodoxy”, *Ancient Sciences, Power, and the Madrasa (“college”) in Ayyubid and early Mamluk Damascus* (Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, preprint 77, Berlin, 1996)
- Brockelmann, Carl, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, 2 vols. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1943-9); 3 supplements (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1937-42)
- , “al-Djuwaynī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&Paris: E.J. Brill & G.-P. Maisonneuve & Larose S.A., 1965), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. II, p. 605-6
- Brunschwig, Robert, “Los teólogos juristas del Islam en pro o en contra de la lógica griega: Ibn Hazm, al-Gazali, Ibn Taymiyya,” in *Al-Andalus*, 35: 1 (1970), p. 143-176
- Brustad, Kristen, “Imposing Order : Reading Conventions of Representation in al-Suyūtī’s Autobiography,” in *Edebiyāt* vol. 2 (1997), p. 326-44
- Busard, H.L.L., (ed.), *The First Latin Translation of Euclid's Elements, commonly ascribed to Adelard of Bath: Books I-VIII and Books X.36-XV.2* (Canada: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1983)
- Caskel, W., “‘Abd al-Ķays,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al*, vol. I, p. 72-4.
- Ceric, Mustafa, *Roots of Synthetic Theology in Islam* (Kuala Lumpur: ISTAC, 1995)
- Chalmeta, P., “al-Mansūr bi’llāh,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. VI, p. 430
- Chamberlain, Michael, *Knowledge and Social Practice in medieval Damascus, 1190-1350* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Daftary, Farhad, *The Ismā’īlīs: Their History and Doctrines* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)
- Daiber, H.[Ragep, F.J.], “al-Ṭūsī, Naṣīr al-Dīn,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000), ed. P. J. Bearman *et al*. vol. X, p. 746-752
- , *Das Theologisch-philosophische System des Mu’ammar Ibn ‘Abbad as-Sulamī (gest. 830 n. Chr.)* (Beirut: Orient-Institut der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 1975)
- , “The Creed (‘Aqīda) of the Ḥanbalite Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī A Newly Discovered Text,” *Studia Arabica and Islamica, Festschrift for Ihsān ‘Abbās on his Sixtieth Birthday*, Wadād al-Qādī (ed.), (Beirut: American

- University of Beirut, 1981), p. 105-125
- Davidson, Herbert, 'John Philoponus as a Source of Medieval Islamic and Jewish Proofs of Creation', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (1969), 357-91
- De Boer, T.J., *Geschichte der Philosophie im Islam*, (Stuttgart: Fr. Frommanns Verlag, 1901)
- Dunlop, D.M., "al-Bādjī," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. III, 54-5
- Ebied, R.Y., "Ibn Dakīk al-Īd," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004), ed. P.J. Bearman *et al*, vol. XII, p. 383
- Endress, G., "Die wissenschaftliche Literatur," in *Grunriß der Arabischen Philologie*, ed. H. Gätje, (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1987), vol. 2, 8, p. 400-73
- Fakhry, Majid, *A History of Islamic Philosophy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983) 2nd. Ed.
- , *Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Mysticism : A Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2000)
- Fierro, M., "al-Tabarānī," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000), ed. P.J. Bearman *et al*, vol. X, p. 10
- Frank, Richard M., "The Science of Kalam," in *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* (1992), 2nd. vol. p. 7-37.
- Gabrieli, F., "Hishām," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. III, p. 493-5
- Al-Gazālī, Abū Ḥāmid, *al-Ghazālī's Book of Fear and Hope* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962), transl. William McKane.
- Gardet, L. et M.M. Anawati, *Introduction à la Théologie Musulmane* (Paris : Vrin, 1948)
- , "Kāda' wa'l-Kadar," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978), ed. E. van Donzel *et al*, vol. IV, p. 365-7
- Geiger, Abraham, *Was hat Mohammad aus dem Judenthum aufgenommen?* (Leipzig: Verlag von M.W.Kaufmann, 1833, reprinted in 1902)
- Geoffroy, E., "al-Suyūṭī," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. IX, p. 915
- Gibb, Sir. H.A., "The Influence of Islamic Culture on Medieval Europe," in *Bulletin of the John Ryland's Library*, Manchester, 38 (1955), p. 82-98
- Gilliot, Claude, *Exégèse, Langue et Théologie en Islam : l'Exégèse Coranique de Tabari* (Paris : Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1990)
- , "Une Leçon Magistrale d'Orientalisme: l'Opus Magnum de J. Van Ess (II)," in *Arabica* (19 , tome XLVII), p.
- , "al-Silafi," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. IX, p. 607-9.
- Glazer, S., "Abū Ḥayyān al-Gharnāṭī," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al*, vol. I, p. 126.
- Goichon, A.M., "Ibn Sīnā," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. III, p. 941-7

- Goldziher, Ignaz, *Introduction to Islamic Theology and Law* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1981); English transl. by Andras and Ruth Hamori, translation from the German *Vorlesungen über den Islam* (Heidelberg: 1910)
- , “The Attitude of Orthodox Islam toward the ‘Ancient Sciences’” in Merlin L. Swartz (ed. and transl.), *Studies on Islam* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), p. 185-215. This is translation from “Die Stellung der alten Orthodoxie zu den antiken Wissenschaften.” in *Gesammelte Schriften* (1970), vol. V, p. 357-400 (originally published in *Abhandlungen der könig. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1915-1916), p. 3-46)).
- , “Zur Charakteristik Ġelāl ud-dīn us-Sūjūtī’s und Seiner literarischen Tätigkeit,” *Gesammelte Schriften* (1967), vol. I, p. 52-73 (originally published in SKAW, LXIX, 1871, p. 7-28)
- Griffel, Frank, *Apostasie und Toleranz im Islam: Die Entwicklung zu al-Gazalīs Urteil gegen die Philosophie und die Reaktionen der Philosophen* (Leiden, Boston & Köln: E.J. Brill, 2000)
- Guillaume, “Some Remarks on Free Will and Predestination in Islam,” JRAS, 1924, p. 43-9
- Günther, Von Sebastian, “Der šāfi‘itische Traditionalist Abū Sulaimān al-Hattābī und die Situation der religiösen Wissenschaften im 10. Jahrhundert,” in ZDMG (1996), vol. 146, no. 1, p. 61-91
- Haleem, M. Abdel, ‘Early Kalam,’ in *History of Islamic Philosophy*, Seyyed Hossein Nasr and Oliver Leaman (Eds.) (London& New York: Routledge, 1996), I, 71-88
- Hallaq, W.B., *Ibn Taymiyya Against the Greek Logicians*, translation with an introduction and notes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993)
- , “Was the Gate of Ijtihad Closed,” IJMES 16 (1984), p. 3-41
- , *The Gate of Ijtihād: A Study of Islamic Legal History* (University Microfilms international, 1983)
- Halm, H., “al-Ķushayrī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. V, p. 526-7
- Haq, Syed Nomanul, “the Indian and Persian Background,” in *History of Islamic Philosophy*, Seyyed Hossein Nasr and Oliver Leaman (Eds.) (London& New York: Routledge, 1996), I, 56-70
- Hartmann, Angelika, *an-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh (1180-1225): Politik, Religion, Kultur in der späten ‘Abbāsidenzeit* (Berlin & New York: Walter de gruyter, 1975)
- , “Al-Suhrawardi, Shihāb al-Dīn Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998), ed. C.E. Bosworth et al, vol. IX, p. 778
- , “Al-Nāṣir li Dīn Allāh,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&New York: E.J. Brill, 1993), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. VII, p. 996-9.
- Al-Hashash, Mohammad, *Zwischen Tradition und Aufbruch Die Ablehnung und Verleumding der spekulativen Theologie-Damm al-Kalam wa ahlih-in der Frühzeit des Islam: Ursachen und Folgen* (Bonn: 2000), Inauguraldissertation.
- Heffening, W., “al-Nawawi” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&New York: E.J. Brill, 1993), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. VII, p.

- Heinen, Anton M., *Islamic Cosmology: A Study of al-Suyūtī's al-Hay'a al-Saniyya fi 'l-Hay'a al-Sunniya, with critical edition, translation and commentary* (Beirut: Orient Institut der deutschen morgendländischen Gesellschaft, 1982)
- Hillenbrand, C., "al-Rashīd," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. VIII, p. 439-40
- Hirschler, Konrad, "Pre-eighteenth-Century traditions of revivalism: Damascus in the thirteenth Century," in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Study*, 68, 2 (2005) 195-214
- Horten, Max, "Der Skeptizismus der Sumanija nach der Darstellung des Razi, 1209", *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, xxiv (1910), 141-66
- , "Indische Gedanken in der islamischen Philosophie," *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie und Soziologie* (1910), vol. 34, p. 310
- , *Die philosophischen Systeme der spekulativen Theologen im Islam* (Bonn: Friedrich Cohen, 1912)
- , "Die Modus-Theorie des Abū Hāshchim," ZDMG, (1909), vol. 63, p. 303
- , "Die Lehre vom Kumūn bei Nazzām (‡ 845)," ZDMG, (1909), vol. 63, p. 780
- Humbert, G., "al-Sīrāfī," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. IX, p. 668-9
- Humphreys, R.S., *Islamic History: A Frame Work for Inquiry* (Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 1992)
- Hunwick, J.O., "Al-Maghīlī," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. V, p. 1165-6
- Ibn Ḥallikān, *Biographical Dictionary*, transl. Bn. Mac Guckin De Slane (Paris: 1842), 4 vols
- Ivanov, W., *Brief Survey of the Evolution of Isma'īlism*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1952)
- Izutsu, Toshihiko, *The Concept of Belief in Islamic Theology: A Semantic Analysis of Īmān and Islām* (Yokohama: Yurindo Publishing co. ltd, 1965)
- Jackson, A.V.W., *Zoroastrian Studies*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1928)
- Jacobi, Herman, "Atomic Theory (Indian)" in Hasting's *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics* (Bonn: 1910)
- Jolivet, J & R. Rashed, "al-Kindī," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. V, p. 122-3
- Jomier, J., "al-Fuṣṭāṭ," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&Paris:E.J. Brill & G.-P. Maisonneuve & Larose S.A., 1965), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. II, p. 957-9
- Al-Juwainī, Imām al-Haramayn, *A Guide to Conclusive Proofs for the Principles of Belief*, transl. Dr. Paul E. Walker (Beirut: Garnet Publishing, 2002)
- Juynboll, G.H.A., *Studies on the Origins and Uses of Islamic Ḥadīth* (Variorum: 1996)
- , "An Excursus on the the *Ahl al-Sunna* in Connection with Van Ess, *Theologie und Gessellschaft*, vol. IV" in *Der Islam* Band 75 Heft 2 (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998), p. 318-329
- , "Josef van Ess' *Theologie und Gessellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra. Eine Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im frühen Islam.* Berlin/New York 1991, 1992 (Walter de Gruyter) Band I, II, III," in *Der Islam* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), Band 71, p. 363-371

- , “Sunna” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al.* vol. IX, p. 878-881
- , “Shu’ba Ibn al-Hajjāj” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill,, 1998), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. IX, p. 491-2
- Katsh, Abraham I., *Judaism in Islam* (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1954)
- Keith, A. B., *Buddhist Philosophy in India and Ceylon* (London: Clarendon Press, 1923)
- Khalidi, Omar, “Guide to Arabic, Persian, Turkish, and Urdu Manuscript Libraries in India,” in MELA Notes 75-76 (Fall 2002-Spring 2003)
- Kinder, R. “Blood Money,” in *The Encyclopaedia of the Qur’ān*, ed. Dammen McAuliffe, vol. I, (Leiden-Boston-Köln: E. J. Brill, 2001), p. 239
- Kohlberg, E., “al-Rāfiḍa,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. VIII, 386-9
- Kopf, L., “al-Djawharī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&Paris: E.J. Brill & G.-P. Maisonneuve & Larose S.A., 1965), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. II, p. 495-7
- Lane, E.W., *Arabic-English Lexicon* (Cambridge: The Islamic Texts Society, 1984), 2 vols
- Laoust, Henri, *La Profession De Foi d’Ibn Batta*, (Damascus : Institut Français de Damas, 1958)
- , “Ibn Taymiyya,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. III, p. 951-5
- , *Les Schismes dans l’Islam* (Paris: Paris Payot, 1965)
- , “Ibn Kathīr,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. III, p. 817-8
- , “Ibn al-Kayyim al-Djawziyya,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. III, p. 981-2
- Leaman Oliver, *Brief Introduction to Islamic Philosophy* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001)
- Lecomte, G., “Ibn Ḥutayba,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. III, p. 844-7.
- Lévi-Provençal, E., “al-Baṭalyawsī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al*, vol. I, p. 1092
- , “‘Alī b. Yūsuf b. Tāshūfin,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al*, vol. I, p. 389
- Lewis, B., et. al., “Ibn Zūlāk,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. III, p. 979
- Lyons, C.W., “Uthūlūdjiyā,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000), ed. P.J. Bearman *et al.*, vol. X, p. 954-5
- Mabilleau, Léopold, *Histoire de la philosophie atomistique* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1895)

- Macdonald, D.B., *Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory*, (London: Routledge, 1903)
- , “Continuous Re-creation and Atomic Time in Moslem Scholastic Theology,” *The Muslim World*, v. 18 (1928), 6-28
- Mackensen, Ruth S., “Suplementary Notes to “Arabic Books and Libraries in the Umayyad Period” in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, vol. 56, no. 2 (April, 1939), p. 149-57
- Madelung, W., “Zaydiyya,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2002), ed. P. J. Bearman *et al*, vol. XI, p. 477-81
- Madkour, I., “La Logique d’Aristote chez les Motakallimīn,” in Mohaghegh, Mahdi and T. Izutsu, *Collected Texts and Papers on Logic and Language* (Tehran : the Tehran University Press, 1974), p. 29-46
- Mahdi, Muhsin, “Language and Logic in Classical Islam” in *Logic in Classical Islamic Culture*, ed. G.E. von Grunebaum, (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1970), p. 51-83
- Madjid, Nurcholish, *Ibn Taymiyya in ‘Kalam’ and ‘Falsafa’ (A Problem of Reason and Revelation in Islam)* (Michigan: UMI Dissertation Services, 1997)
- Mahdi, Muhsin, “Language and Logic in Classical Islam” in *Logic in Classical Islamic Culture*, ed. G.E. von Grunebaum, (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1970), p. 51-83
- Makdisi, G., *The Rise of Humanism in Classical Islam and the Christian West: With Special Reference to Scholasticism* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990)
- , “Law and Traditionalism in the Institutions of Learning of Medieval Islam” in *Theology and Law in Islam*, ed. G.E. von Grunebaum (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1971), p. 75-89
- , “The Non-Ash‘arite Shafi‘ism of Abū Ḥāmid Ghazzālī”, in *Revue des Etudes Islamiques*, (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1986) LIV, p. 239-257
- , “Ashari and the Asharites in Islamic Religious History” in *Studia Islamica* (G- P. Maisonneuve –Larose Paris), XVII & XVIII, 1962, p. 37-80 & 19-39
- , “The Juridical Theology of Shafi’i: Origins and Significance of Usul al-Fiqh” in *Studia Islamica*, LIX, 1984, p. 5-48
- , “Law and Traditionalism in the Institutions of Learning of Medieval Islam” in *Theology and Law in Islam*, ed. G.E. von Grunebaum (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1971, 1971), p. 75-89
- , “Hanbalite Islam,” in Merlin L. Swartz (ed. and tran.), *Studies on Islam* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), p. 216-274
- , *Ibn Qudāma’s Censure of Speculative Theology: An Edition and Translation of Ibn Qudāma’s Tahrīm al-Naṣar fī Kutub Ahl al-Kalām* (London: Luzac & Company Ltd., 1962)
- Margoliouth, D.S., “The Discussion between Abū Bishr Mattā and Abū Sa‘id al-Sirāfi on the Merits of Logic and Grammar”, in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1905, p. 79-129
- Marmura, Michael E., “Ghazali and Ash‘arism Revisited,” in *Arabic Science and Philosophy*, vol. 12 (2002), p. 91-110
- , “Ghazali’s Attitude to the Secular Sciences and Logic,” in *Essays on Islamic Philosophy and Science*, ed. G.F. Hourani (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1975), p. 100-111

- Mårtensson, Ulrika, “Discourse and Historical Analysis: The Case of al-Tabarī’s History of the Messengers and the Kings,” in *Journal of Islamic Studies* 16:3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 287-331
- Massignon, L., “Abū Ṭālib al-Makki”, in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb et al, vol. I, p. 153
- , “Les systèmes philosophiques des motakallimoūn en Islam selon Horten”, *Der Islam*, vol. 3, (1912), p. 404-9
- McAuliffe, Jane Dammen, *Qur’anic Christians: An Analysis of Classical and Modern Exegesis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- McCarthy, R. J., “al-Bākillānī”, in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb et al, vol. I, p. 958
- Meyerhof, Max, “New Light on Hunain b. Ishāq and his Period,” in *ISIS* (1925), VIII, 685-724
- Miranda, A. H., “Abū Yūsuf Ya‘qub,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb et al, vol. I, p. 165-66
- Munk, S., *Mélanges de philosophie juive et arabe*, (Paris: Frank, 1859)
- Nader, A.N., *Le système philosophique des Mutazila (Premiers penseurs de l’Islam)* (Beyrouth: l’Institut de Letteres Orientales, 1956)
- Nagel, Tilman, *Geschichte der islamischen Theologie Von Mohammed bis zur Gegenwart* (München: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1993)
- Neuemark, David, *Geschichte der jüdischen Philosophie des Mittelalters nach Problemen dargestellt* (Berlin: Reimer, 1907-1928), I, 84, 115
- Pavlin, J., “Sunni Kalām and Theological Controversies,” in *History of Islamic Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 1996), ed. Seyyed Hossein Nasr and Oliver Leaman, vol. I, p. 105-118
- Pellat, Ch., “Ibn Djubayr,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis et al, vol. III, p. 755
- , “al-Mahalli,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986), ed. C.E. Bosworth et al, vol. V, p. 1223
- Pines, Salomon, *Beiträge zur Islamischen Atomenlehre* (Berlin: 1939)
- Poonawala, I., “Ta’wil,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000), ed. P.J. Bearman et al, vol. X, p. 390-392
- Pretzl, Otto, “Die frühislamische Atomenlehre: Ein Beitrag zur Frage über die Beziehungen der frühislamische Theologie zur griechischen Philosophie,” *Der Islam*, 19 (1931), 117-130
- Raddatz, H.P., “Sufyān al-Thawrī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998), ed. C.E. Bosworth et al, vol. IX, p. 770-2
- Rahman, F., “Arād,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb et al, vol. I, p. 603
- Rescher, Nicholas, *The Development of Arabic Logic* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964)
- Robson, J., “al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad b. Ismā‘il,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb et al, vol. I, p. 1296-7

- , “Ibn al-‘Arabī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. III, p. 707
- Rosenthal, F., *Das Fortleben der Antike im Islam* (Zürich and Stuttgart: Artemis Verlag, 1965)
- Al-Rouayheb, Khaled, “Sunnī Muslim Scholars on the Status of Logic, 1500-1800,” in *Islamic Law and Society* (2004), vol. II, no. 2, p. 213-32.
- Sadan, J., “Genizah and Genizah-Like Practices in Islamic and Jewish Traditions,” in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 43 (1986), 36-58
- Saleh, Marlis J., “al-Suyūtī and His Works: Their Place in Islamic Scholarship from Mamluk Times to the Present,” in *Mamlük Studies Review*, 5 (2001), 73-89.
- Salibi, K.S., “Ibn Djamā‘a,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. III, p. 748-9
- Sartain, E. M., *Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūtī: Biography and Background* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).
- Schacht, J., “Mālik b. Anas” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. VI, p. 262-5
- , “Abū Ḥanīfa al-Nu‘mān,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al*, vol. I, p. 123-4
- , “Abu Yusuf” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al*, vol. I, p. 164-5
- , Schacht, J., “Idjtihād,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. III, p. 1026
- Seale, Morris, *Muslim Theology, a Study of Origins with Reference to the Church Fathers*, (London: Luzac & Co. Ltd, 1964)
- Sellheim, R., “al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978), ed. E. van Donzel *et al*, vol. IV, p. 1111-2
- , “al-Sam‘ānī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. VIII, p. 1024-5
- Schacht, J., “Abū Thawr,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al*, vol. I, p. 155
- Schmölders, Augustus, *Essai sur les Ecoles philosophiques chez les Arabes, et notamment sur la doctrine d’Algazzali* (Paris: Typographie de Firmin Didot Frères, 1842)
- Schreiner, Dr. Martin, “Der Kalām in der jüdischen Literatur,” *Bericht über die Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums in Berlin* 13 (1895), pp. 1-67
- Sezgin, Fuat, *Geschichte des arabischen Schriftums* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967-1984), vols. 1-ix
- Shedd, W.A., *Islam and the Oriental Churches* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school work, 1904)
- Sourdel, D., “Une Profession de Foi de l’Historien al-Tabarī,” in *Revue des Etudes Islamique* (1968) XXXVI, fasc. 2.

- , [W. Barthold]., “al-Barāmika,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al*, vol. I, p. 1033-6
- , “Hādjib,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. III, p. 45.
- Spectorsky, S.A., “Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998), ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al*, vol. IX, p. 772
- Speyer, Heinrich, *Die Biblischen Erzählungen im Qoran* (Gräfenhainichen: Druck von C. Schulze & Co. GMBH, 1931)
- Stepaniants, Marietta, ‘The Encounter of Zoroastrianism with Islam’, in *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 52, n. 1 (2002)
- Suter, H., “al-Magest,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1st Edition (Leyden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1913), ed. M. Th. Houtsma, *et al*, vol. I, p. 313
- Swartz, Merlin L., *Studies on Islam* (Oxford/New York, Oxford University Press, 1981)
- Sweetman, W.J., *Islam and Christian Theology*, (London: Lutterworth, 1945-1967)
- Al-Tabarī, *The History of al-Tabarī, General Introduction and From the Creation to the Flood*, translation and annotated by Franz Rosenthal, (New York: State University Press, 1989)
- Torrey, Ch. C., *The Jewish Foundation of Islam* (New York, 1933)
- Tritton, A.S., *Materials on Muslim Education in the Middle Ages* (London: Luzac & Co., 1957)
- , “Foreign Influences on Muslim Theology” (BSOAS, vol. 10, 4 (1942), p. 837-842
- Ullmann, Manfred, *Die Natur- und Geheimwissenschaften im Islam* (Köln & Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972)
- Vadet, J.C., “Ibn ‘l-Hādjib,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. III, p. 781-2
- , “Ibn Shubruma,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. III, p. 938.
- Vagliari, L. Veccia “(al-) Hasan b. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1971), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. III, p. 240-243
- Vajda, G., “Sharaf al-Dīn al-Dimyātī ,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&Paris: E.J. Brill & G.-P. Maisonneuve & Larose S.A., 1965), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. II, p. 292
- Van Donzel, et al, “al-Khaṭṭābī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978), ed. E. van Donzel *et al*, vol. IV, p. 1131-2.
- Van Ess, Josef, *Anfänge Muslimischer Theologie* (Beirut: Orient Institut der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 1977)
- , *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra, Eine Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im frühen Islam* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991-1998), 6 vols.
- , “Skepticism in Islamic Religious Thought,” in *Al-Abhāth* (March 1968) vol. XXI, no. 1, p. 1-18
- , “The Logical Structure of Islamic Theology,” in *Classical Islamic Culture*

- (ed.) G.E. von Grunebaum (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1970)
- , “al-Tashbih wa ‘l-Tanzīh,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000), ed. P. J. Bearman *et al*, vol. X, p. 341-4
- , “The Beginning of Islamic Theology,” in *The Cultural Context in Medieval Learning* ed. J.E. Murdoch & E.D. Sylla (Dordrecht/Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1975) p. 87-111
- , “Disputationpraxis in der Islamischen Theologie: Eine vorläufige Skizze,” in REI, 44 (1976), p. 23-60
- , “Early Development of Kalām,” in *Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society*, ed. G.H.A. Juynboll (Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982), p. 109-123
- , “60 Years After: Shlomo Peines’s *Beiträge* and Half a Century of Research on Atomism in Islamic Theology,” *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*, (Jerusalem, 2002), viii, 2, p. 19-41
- Van Koningsveld, P. S., “Greek Manuscripts in the Early Abbasid Empire: Fiction and Facts about their Origin, Translation and Destruction,” in BOĀ LV no. 3/4, Mei-August (1998), p. 345-370
- Von Grunebaum, G.E., “Islam and Hellenism,” in *Logic in Classical Islamic Culture* (ed.) G.E. von Grunebaum (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1970)
- , “Abū Shāma,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al*, vol. I, p. 150
- von Kremer, Alfred, *Geschichte der herrschenden Ideen des Islams* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1868), p. 8, 32-3
- , *Culturgeschichtliche Streifzüge auf dem Gebiete des Islams* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1873)
- Walzer, R., “al-Fārābī,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&Paris: E.J. Brill & G.-P. Maisonneuve & Larose S.A., 1965), ed. B. Lewis *et al*, vol. II, p. 778-81
- Watt, Montgomery W., *The Influence of Islam on Medieval Europe* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1972)
- , *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1973)
- , *Islamic Philosophy and Theology* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1962)
- , “Amr b. ‘Ubayd,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al*, vol. I, p. 454.
- , “al-Ash‘arī, Abu ’l-Hasan,” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al*, vol. I, p. 694-5.
- Wehr, Hans, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, ed. I. Milton Cowan (Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1974)
- Wensinck, E.J., *The Muslim Creed: Its Genesis and Historical Development* (New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1979)
- Wiedeman, E., “al-Kīmiyā’ in *the Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1st Edition, (Leyden& London: E.J. Brill & Luzac & Co., 1927), ed. M. Th. Houtsma, *et. al.*, vol. II, p. 110-17
- Wolfson, H.A., *The Philosophy of Kalam* (London, Massachussets & Cambridge:

Harvard University Press, 1976)

- Wüstenfeld, F., *Ueber das Leben und die Schriften des Scheich Abu Zakarija Jahja el-Nawawi* (Göttingen: Dieterichschen Buchhandlung, 1849)

Zetterstéen, K.V., "Ahmad b. Abī Du‘ād," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, (Leiden&London: E.J. Brill& Luzac & Co, 1960), ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al.*, vol. I, p. 271

Zipor, Moshe A., "Some Notes on the Origin of the Tradition of the Eighteen Tiqqûnê Sôperîm," in *Vetus Testamentum* XLIV, 1 (1994), p. 77-102

Works in Indonesian Language:

- Ali, Mufti, "Aristotelianisme dalam Kaca Mata Para Tokoh Abad Tengah Penentang Logika," *Alqalam* (IAIN Banten, Indonesia, September-Desember 2007), XXIV, p. 318-339

Anwar, Saeful, *Filsafat Ilmu Al-Gazālī: Analisis Tentang Dimensi Ontology, Epistemologi dan Aksiologi Ilmu Era Peripatetik* (Scientific Philosophy of al-Gazālī: An Analysis of Ontological, Epistemological and Axiological Dimensions of Science in the Peripatetical Era), unpublished dissertation (Yogyakarta, Indonesia, 2000)

Nasution, Harun, *Teologi Islam: Aliran-aliran Sejarah Analisa Perbandingan* (Jakarta: Yayasan Penerbit Universitas Indonesia, 1972)

Internet:

www.idc.nl/faid/441faidb.html

www.alwaraq.com

www.al-azharonline.com

Samenvatting

In de **Introductie** behandel ik de moderne wetenschappelijke discussie omtrent de oorsprong van de Islamitische theologie, en het standpunt van al-Suyūṭī met betrekking tot dat onderwerp. Het modern wetenschappelijk onderzoek omtrent dit onderwerp kan worden onderverdeeld in zes verschillende stromingen, die respectievelijk uitgaan van: (1) de Hellenistische oorsprong van de Islamitische theologie; (2) Islamitische theologie als voornamelijk het resultaat van een interne ontwikkeling; (3) Christelijke invloeden op de Islamitische theologie; (4) Joodse bijdragen aan de Islamitische theologie; (5) Perzische elementen in de Islamitische theologie; en (6) Indiase elementen in de Islamitische theologie. Hoewel ieder van deze visies zijn eigen belangrijke pleitbezorgers heeft, moet worden onderstreept dat de visie van de Hellenistische invloed op de oorsprong en ontwikkeling van de Islamitische theologie nog steeds de belangrijkste positie inneemt in de moderne wetenschap.

Daarnaast behandel ik de moderne wetenschappelijke discussie omtrent de geschiedenis van het Islamitische verzet tegen de logica en de theologie. Van de moderne zienswijzen die specifiek betrekking hebben op het Islamitische verzet tegen de logica, behandel ik Goldziher, Madkour, Hartmann, al-Nashshār, al-Tabātabā'ī, Hallaq, Endress, Van Koningsveld, en Griffel. Wat betreft het Islamitische verzet tegen theologie (*kalām*) en de *mutakallimūn*, bespreek ik de denkbeelden van Makdisi, Daiber, Pavlin, Abrahams, Juynboll en al-Hashshash.

Over de positie van al-Suyūṭī kan worden opgemerkt dat zijn visie opvallende overeenkomsten vertoont met die van enkele moderne wetenschappers, die van mening zijn dat de ontwikkeling van *kalām* niet alleen te wijten is aan een externe factor, nl. de vertaal-beweging van Griekse geschriften, maar ook aan een interne factor, nl. de behoefte aan een vorm van debateerkunst voor discussies van religieuze aard.

Deze studie probeert een antwoord te formuleren op de vraag wat men kan leren van al-Suyūṭī's vier geschriften tegen de logica en de theologie omtrent de geschiedenis van de Islamitische veroordeling van logica en theologie, in aanvulling op wat de moderne wetenschap hierover heeft te zeggen. De volgende werken van al-Suyūṭī zijn voor deze studie geraadpleegd: (1) *al-Qawl al-Mushriq*, (2) *Jahd al-Qariha*, (3) *Sawn al-Manṭiq*, en (4) de *Fatwā* tegen de logica.

Het eerste hoofdstuk behandelt de manuscripten en de editie van *al-Qawl al-Mushriq* (QM), het tijdstip waarop het werd geschreven en het doel waarvoor, en geeft tevens een analyse van de inhoud. QM werd in 868/1466 geschreven, toen al-Suyūṭī pas 19 was. In dit werk bespreekt al-Suyūṭī, direct danwel indirekt het verzet tegen de logica van meer dan 40 vooraanstaande geleerden van verschillende faculteiten in de rechten door te verwijzen naar meer dan 28 werken die, direct of indirekt hetzelfde onderwerp behandelen. Dit hoofdstuk bepleit tevens dat dit werk een onmisbare bron vormt voor de geschiedenis van het Islamitische verzet tegen de logica. In zijn betoog tegen de logica verwijst de auteur direct of indirekt naar 44 geleerden van verscheidene rechten-scholen, te beginnen bij al-Shāfi'ī (d. 203/820) en eindigend bij de Shāfi'iet Ibn al-Ṣadr al-

Balbīsī (d. 904/1499), en daarnaast naar 28 werken die, direkt of indirekt, handelen over het verzet tegen de logica.

Het tweede hoofdstuk bespreekt het tweede geschrift tegen de logica dat al-Suyūtī samenstelde, nl. *Jahd al-Qariha*, een samenvatting *Nāṣīḥa. Jahd al-Qariha* van Ibn Taymiyya, geschreven in 888/1488 toen al-Suyūtī 38 jaar oud was. In dit werk bespreekt al-Suyūtī de poging die in IT wordt ondernomen om de belangrijkste stellingen te weerleggen waarop de logica is gefundeerd, namelijk: (1) *Al-taṣawwur lā yunālu illā bi ՚l-hadd* (een concept kan niet anders worden bepaald dan door definitie); (2) *Al-hadd mufid taṣawwur al-ashyā'* (definitie leidt tot de conceptualisering van dingen), (3) *Al-taṣdiq lā yunālu illā bi ՚l-qiyās* (een oordeel kan niet anders worden gevormd dan aan de hand van analogie), en (4) *Al-burhān yufīd al-՚ilm bi ՚l-taṣdiqāt* (aantoonbaarheid leidt tot zekere kennis omtrent oordelen).

Het derde hoofdstuk bespreekt al-Suyūtī's *Sawn al-Mantiq*, dat in 888 werd geschreven, hetzelfde jaar als *Jahd al-Qariha*, toen enkele tijdgenoten van al-Suyūtī zijn aanspraak op *ijtihād* afwezen, omdat het hem naar hun oordeel ontbrak aan de mate van kennis van de logica die hiervoor een van de voorwaarden was. Dit werk handelt over de geschiedenis en de oorsprong van de logica, haar introductie in de Islamitische wereld, de afwijzende reactie van vooraanstaande geleerden, haar verwantschap met de theologie, de afwijzing van de theologie door Islamitische geleerden en de weerlegging van degenen die de logica binnen de grammatica hadden geïntroduceerd. Voorts vindt men in dit werk een besprekking, samenvatting en beschrijving van 12 werken door voorgangers van al-Suyūtī die *kalām* en de *mutakallimūn* veroordeelden. Daarbij verzamelt al-Suyūtī in dit werk ook nog de argumenten tegen de logica van meer dan 36 geleerden van verschillende stromingen.

Naast het manuscript van de *fatwā*, behandelt **het vierde hoofdstuk** ook de inhoud van al-Suyūtī's *fatwā* tegen de logica. Net als andere *fatwās* begint deze met een vraagstelling, over het onderwerp van de logica, en hierop volgt dan het antwoord van al-Suyūtī, die de logica verbiedt en hiervoor verwijst naar 43 geleerden die volgens hem eveneens de logica afwezen. Deze *fatwā* vormt een onmisbare bron voor de geschiedenis van het Islamitische verzet tegen de logica, en wel om de volgende reden: bij het uitvaardigen van de *fatwā* verwijst al-Suyūtī naar twee werken: *al-Shāmil* van Ibn al-Šabbāg en *al-Risāla* van Ibn Abī Zayd, welke hij nog niet eerder had genoemd, en voorts naar een groot aantal autoriteiten van verschillende juridische stromingen, waarvan hij er negentien nog niet had behandeld in zijn QM, JQ en SM.

Na de werken tegen de logica en theologie van al-Suyūtī te hebben vergeleken met de moderne wetenschap omtrent dit onderwerp, concludeer ik dat deze vier werken een rijk historisch document vormen van het Islamitische verzet tegen logica en theologie, waarvan moderne wetenschappers die dit onderwerp bestuderen zich terdege rekenschap dienen te geven. In zijn vier geschriften poogt al-Suyūtī zijn lezers ervan te overtuigen dat de logica door 68 vooraanstaande geleerden werd veroordeeld. Een analyse van de inhoud van deze vier werken wijst er op dat een afkeer van de logica een belangrijk element werd in het Sunnitische

traditionalisme, met name gedurende de 13e, 14e en 15e eeuw. Een prosopografische analyse van de tegenstanders van de logica die door al-Suyūṭī worden genoemd wijst uit dat de logica werd afgewezen door vooraanstaande Sunni geleerden in Valencia, Fez, Aleppo, Irak, and Mekka, en met name ook in Egypte and Syrië.

Bij bestudering van een recent ontdekt manuscript van QM en van de *fatwā* van al-Suyūṭī word de juistheid bevestigd van de beschrijving die al-Nashshār in 1947 gaf van een van de werken van al-Suyūṭī die hier worden besproken, namelijk SM: “*wa hādhā ḥ-ḥitāb yu’tabar awsa’ mawsū’at fīmā na’lam fī mawdū’ naqd al-manṭiq al-yūnānī*,” om te kennen te geven dat al-Suyūṭī’s SM de meest complete encyclopedie vormt m.b.t. de [Islamitische] kritiek op de Griekse logica.

Curriculum Vitae

Mufti Ali was born in Banten in August 6, 1972. He graduated from Islamic High School (*al-Madrasa al-‘Āliyya al-Sa‘āda*) in 1992. In 1993-1998, he followed Islamic Studies' courses at the Faculty of Islamic Law at the State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) 'Sultan Gunung Djati' in Serang (Banten). In September 1998, he started his post-graduate courses on Islamic Studies within the framework of the Indonesian-Netherlands Co-operation for Islamic Studies (INIS) at the Leiden University. He obtained the degree of M.A. in Islamic Studies at Leiden University from both the Faculty of Arts and of Theology, with his thesis, *Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūtī against Logic and Kalām: Analysis and Significance of Sawn al-Manṭiq wa ’l-Kalām ‘an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa ’l-Kalām*. In November 2001, he was accepted as Ph.D. fellow at the INIS-program at Leiden University. Currently, he is staff lecturer at the Faculty of Theology in the State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) Banten, Indonesia. During his study at the Leiden University, he has also published a number of articles:

1. "Imām Sibawaihi dan Karya Utamanya, al-Kitāb: Tinjauan Bibliografis," *Alqalam* (IAIN Banten, Indonesia: Maret-Juni 2001), XIX, p. 1-31.
2. "The Image of the History of the Muslim Opposition against Kalām and Logic Reflected in Modern Literature," *Alqalam* (IAIN Banten, Indonesia: Juli-September 2002), XXI, p. 117-137.
3. "A Study of Hasan Muṣṭafā's Fatwā: 'It is Incumbent upon the Indonesian Muslims to be Loyal to the Dutch East Indies Government,'" *Quarterly Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society* (Karachi Pakistan, April-June 2004), vol. LII, no. 2, p. 91-122.
4. "Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti Against Logic and Kalam: Analysis and Significance of Sawn al-Manṭiq wa ’l-Kalam ‘an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa ’l-Kalam," *Hamard Islamicus* (Pakistan: 2005), XXVIII, 2, p. 23-44.
5. "Metode al-Suyūtī (w. 909/1505 meringkas *al-Radd ‘ala ’l-Manṭiqiyyn* karya Ibn Taymiyya (w. 729/1329)," *Mihrab* (Jakarta: Ministry of Religious Affairs, Oktober 2006), no. 2, IV, p. 43-59.
6. "Anti-Kalām Movement among the Shi'ites: with Particular Reference to *Tarjih Asālib al-Qur’ān* and *al-Rawd al-Bāsim* by the Zaydite Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Wazīr al-San‘ānī (d. 840/1436)," *Alqalam* (IAIN Banten Indonesia: Maret-Juni 2006), XXXIII, p. 76-90.
7. "The Significance of *Dhamm al-Kalām wa Ahlih* by *al-Harawī* (d. 481/1089) as a Source of al-Suyūtī's (d. 909/1505) *Sawn al-Manṭiq wa ’l-Kalām ‘an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa ’l-Kalām*," *Alqalam* (IAIN Banten Indonesia: September-Desember 2006), XXXIII, p. 67-87.
8. "Upaya Kontekstualisasi Fikih Kyai Indonesia di Belanda," *Mihrab* (Jakarta: Ministry for Religious Affairs, no. I, vol. IV, September 2006), p. 5-20.
9. "Historiografi Kesultanan Banten: Bias Visi *Pax-Companica* dalam Beberapa Karya Sejarawan Belanda," *Alqalam* (IAIN Banten Indonesia: Januari-April, 2007), XXIV, p. 146-158.
10. "Historical Survey of the Opposition against Philosophy, Aristotle's Logic and Discursive Theology," *Alqalam* (IAIN Banten Indonesia: Mei-Agustus, 2007), XXIV, p. 279-300.

11. "Aristotelianisme dalam Kaca Mata Para Tokoh Abad Tengah Penentang Logika," *Alqalam* (IAIN Banten Indonesia: September-Desember, 2007), XXIV, p. 318-339
12. "Meminjam Epistemologi Asing adalah Historis," *Ma'arif* (Jakarta: Maarif Institute for Culture and Humanity, July, 2007), vol. 2, p. 50-4.
13. "The Contextualization of Fiqh al-Ibadah among Indonesian Religious Teachers and their Communities in the Circles of the PPME in Amsterdam and The Hague," *Hamdard Islamicus* (April-June 2007), vol. xxx, 2, Karachi Pakistan, h. 61-75.
14. "An Unnoticed Treatise against *Kalām*: Translation of al-Hattābī's (d. 388/988) *al-Gunya 'an al-Kalām*," *Hamdard Islamicus* (Karachi, Pakistan), no. /vol. /January-April/2008, p. 34-50.
15. "A Statistical Potrait of the Resistance to Logic by Sunni Muslim Scholars Based on the Works of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūtī (849-909/1448-1505)," *Islamic Law and Society* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2008), vol. xv, 2, p. 23-41.
16. "Al-Suyūtī's Contribution to the Historiography of the Muslim Opposition against Logic: with Special Reference to *al-Qawl al-Mushriq fī Tahrīm al-Ishtigāl bi 'Ilm al-Manṭiq*," forthcoming in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* (2009)
17. "How did al-Suyūtī Abridge Ibn Taymiyya's *Naṣīḥat Ahl al-Īmān fī al-Radd 'alā Manṭiq al-Yūnān?*," forthcoming in *Bibliotheca Orientalis*.

